arXiv:1701.05956v1 [math.AG] 21 Jan 2017

COMINUSCULE POINTS AND SCHUBERT VARIETIES

WILLIAM GRAHAM AND VICTOR KREIMAN

Abstract. Let X be a generalized flag variety for a semisimple algebraic group G, T a maximal torus in G, and Y a Schubert variety in X. In this paper, we define what it means for a T-fixed point in Y to be cominuscule. We derive formulas expressing the Hilbert series and multiplicity of Y at a cominuscule point in terms of the restrictions of classes in T-equivariant K-theory and cohomology to that point. Thus, we can calculate Hilbert series and multiplicities in cases where these were previously unknown. If X is of cominuscule type, then every T-fixed point in Y is cominuscule, and our formulas specialize to previously known formulas. The formulas for Schubert varieties are special cases of more general formulas valid at what we call generalized cominuscule points of schemes with torus actions.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Notation and preliminaries 5
3. Generalized cominuscule points 13
4. Preliminaries on Schubert varieties 21
5. Slices to Schubert varieties 26
6. Cominuscule points of Schubert varieties 34
7. Examples 47
References 56

1. Introduction

In this paper we introduce and study a condition on the torus-fixed points of a scheme with a torus action. If this condition is satisfied, we call the point a generalized cominuscule point, and we show that the Hilbert series and multiplicity of the variety at that point can be expressed in terms of torus-equivariant K-theory and Chow groups. In the setting of Schubert varieties, we introduce a more precise condition, and call a

Date: January 24, 2017.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14M15; Secondary 05E15.

point satisfying this condition a cominuscule point. As the name suggests, the definition is motivated by the case of Schubert varieties in cominuscule flag varieties, and indeed, for such Schubert varieties, any torus-fixed point is a cominuscule point. However, our condition is satisfied in a broader class of examples, and allows the calculation of Hilbert series and multiplicities in cases where these were previously unknown.

To describe our results in more detail, we introduce some notation. Let G be a semisimple algebraic group and $B \supset T$ a Borel subgroup and maximal torus, respectively. Let B^- denote the opposite Borel subgroup to B. Let $P \supset B$ be a standard parabolic subgroup. Write $X = G/B$ for the full flag variety of G, and X_P for the generalized flag variety G/P. The Schubert varieties in X or X_P are the closures of the B^--orbits (later in the paper we also consider the B-orbits, which are essentially equivalent). Each Schubert variety has finitely many T-fixed points, and each B^--orbit is the orbit of a unique T-fixed point. The fixed points in G/B are in bijection with the Weyl group W of G.

This paper focuses on two local invariants of a Schubert variety at a point, namely, the Hilbert series and multiplicity. Since these invariants are preserved by the B^--action, it suffices to consider these invariants at the T-fixed points. Although Schubert varieties—because of their importance in geometry, representation theory and combinatorics—have been intensely studied, these invariants can at present be computed only in special cases.

One case where the invariants can be computed is that of Schubert varieties in a generalized flag variety X_P of cominuscule type. The reason is that the tangent spaces of the ambient variety X_P at T-fixed points are representations of T with the property that if V is such a tangent space representation, then there exists v in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}$ of T such that $\alpha(v) = -1$ for any weight α of T on V. This property allows the Hilbert series and multiplicity of any T-stable subvariety of X_P at a T-fixed point to be expressed in terms of T-equivariant K-theory and Chow group invariants which, for Schubert varieties, are computable. This has been explored by several authors; see [GK15] for a discussion and references.

The key observation of this paper is that the Hilbert series and multiplicity can be expressed in terms of equivariant data under a weaker tangent space condition. Instead of requiring $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all weights α of the tangent space at a T-fixed point of the ambient variety, we require it for a smaller set of weights—the weights of the Zariski tangent space of a slice to the variety in question. We call a point where this condition holds a generalized cominuscule point of the variety. In the case of a Schubert variety, we specify a particular slice, and if the condition is satisfied using that slice, we say the point is a cominuscule point of the Schubert variety. Because we are imposing a weaker condition, it is satisfied in more examples. At generalized cominuscule points, we prove formulas expressing the Hilbert series and multiplicity in terms of the pullbacks of the classes in K-theory and equivariant Chow groups,

respectively (see Theorem 6.14). There exist formulas to calculate these pullbacks, so we obtain formulas for Hilbert series and multiplicities in new cases. Note, however, that to apply the formulas of Theorem 6.14, it may be necessary to cancel terms in the numerator and denominator of a rational expression (see Remark 6.15). In a sequel [GK17], we give a combinatorial description of a set of canceling terms which suffice to perform the evaluation. Moreover, we show that canceling these terms makes it possible to evaluate the formulas without having to find v.

Kazhdan and Lusztig constructed slices to Schubert varieties by intersecting a Schubert variety with the big cell of an opposite Schubert variety. The slices we use are similar to theirs, but the definition is modified, because the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties are sometimes bigger than necessary. For example, the natural projection $\pi : X \to X_P$ is a fiber bundle with smooth fibers isomorphic to P/B. If Y_P is a Schubert variety in G/P, then the inverse image $Y = \pi^{-1}(Y_P)$ is a Schubert variety in X. Because the fibers are smooth, the singularity of Y at at a T-fixed point y is essentially equivalent to the singularity of Y_P at $\pi(y)$. However, the Kazhdan-Lusztig-type variety at $\pi(y)$ of Y_P can be smaller than the Kazhdan-Lusztig variety of Y at y. The slices we use are defined so that the slice of Y at y is isomorphic to the Kazhdan-Lusztig variety of Y_P at $\pi(y)$, where P is chosen as large as possible so that Y is the inverse image of a Schubert variety Y_P in X_P. This definition produces slices which behave well under projections of flag varieties, and allows for a clean statement of results.

There is an effective test for whether a point in a Schubert variety is cominuscule, in case G is classical. The Zariski tangent spaces of the slices can be described in terms of the Zariski tangent spaces of the Schubert varieties, and for classical groups, these have been described combinatorially. Thus, one can determine if a T-fixed point in a Schubert variety is cominuscule. We use this to show that there are examples of cominuscule points in Schubert varieties which are essentially new, in the sense that the Schubert varieties are not inverse images of Schubert varieties in cominuscule flag varieties under a projection of flag varieties. Some examples are worked out in Section 7, where the multiplicity at some cominuscule points is calculated.

This paper contains basic results about the combinatorics associated to cominuscule points. In a sequel [GK17] to this paper we explore computational and combinatorial aspects of cominuscule points. In particular, in type A, we characterize these points and give combinatorial rules for their Hilbert series and multiplicities in terms of the pipe dreams of Fomin-Kirillov [FK96], Bergeron-Billey [BB93], and Knutson-Miller [KM05]. We also plan to explore generalizations of the excited Young diagrams of [IN09], [GK15], [Kre05], and [Kre06] in this setting.

The ideas in this paper are closely related to ideas appearing in earlier work. Li and Yong [LY12] study the type A case of Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties, which are by definition the intersection of a Schubert variety with the big cell of an opposite Schubert variety. They use coordinates on the big cell to identify the big cell with affine space. The

Kazhdan-Lusztig ideal is the ideal of the Kazdan-Lusztig variety in the coordinate ring of this affine space, and [WY12] gives formulas for the multigraded (by the torus action) Hilbert series of the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties. Li and Yong observe that if the Kazhdan-Lusztig ideal happens to be homogeneous with respect to the standard grading on the variables (where each variable has degree 1)—which is equivalent to the Kazhdan-Lusztig variety being invariant under dilation—then these multigraded Hilbert series can be used to obtain the usual Hilbert series and multiplicity. They also point out that Knutson [Knu09] had previously observed that this homogeneity is always guaranteed if the Weyl group element defining the fixed point is (up to a shift by the longest element of the Weyl group) λ-cominuscule in the sense of Peterson. The reason is that in this case, there is a 1-parameter subgroup of T giving the dilation action on the big cell of the opposite Schubert variety. Since the Kazhdan-Lusztig variety is T-invariant, it is therefore dilation invariant.

The approach in this paper differs in several ways from the preceding work. Our approach is designed to make the space for which one needs to find a suitable 1-parameter subgroup as small as possible, since if the space is smaller, such a space is easier to find. We achieve this in two ways. First, instead of intersecting the Schubert variety with the big cell of an opposite Schubert variety (as in the case of the Kazhdan-Lusztig variety), we use a slice which is generally smaller, made by intersecting the Schubert variety with a proper subspace of the big cell. More significantly, instead of using the slice itself, we (in effect) replace the slice by its tangent cone at the point. Unlike the slice itself, the tangent cone is guaranteed to lie inside the Zariski tangent space at the point, which is a subspace of the affine space containing the slice. (See Remark 3.7 and Example 3.8 for some discussion and an example of the situation, which has some subtleties.) Also, instead of studying the Kazhdan-Lusztig ideal, as in [LY12], we use equivariant Chow groups and K-theory, along the lines of [IN09] and [GK15]. Finally, the main results of this paper apply not just to type A, but uniformly to all types. Using these ideas, we obtain new examples (even in type A) of points in Schubert varieties where we can calculate Hilbert series and multiplicities.

The contents of the paper are as follows. Section 2 contains some definitions and results about K-theory and intersection theory of schemes with torus actions that are needed in what follows. Section 3 defines the notion of a generalized cominuscule point of a scheme with a torus action (see Definition 3.4). The main result of this section is Theorem 3.10, which gives formulas for the multiplicity and Hilbert series of a scheme at a generalized cominuscule point. This is a general result not limited to the case of Schubert varieties.

The remainder of the paper focuses on Schubert varieties. Note that there are two types of Schubert varieties, namely, closures of B^--orbits and closures of B-orbits. In principle it is enough to consider only one type, because results can be translated from one version to another. Nevertheless, both types appear in the literature, so to make

the paper easier to use as a reference, we explicitly state most results for both types, although we usually give the proofs for only one type.

Section 4.1 contains some background about algebraic groups, Weyl groups, and Schubert varieties, and Section 4.2 recalls the behavior of Schubert varieties under projections. In Section 4.3, we introduce the notion of a maximal parabolic with respect to a Schubert variety (note that such a parabolic need not be a maximal parabolic in the usual sense). This notion is used in our construction of slices to Schubert varieties at T-fixed points, which is given in Section 5 (see Definition 5.4). The relation of these slices to the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties is discussed in Remarks 5.5 and 5.6. We show in this section that our slices behave well with respect to projections of Schubert varieties (see Proposition 5.11). Section 6.1 gives the definition of cominuscule points in Schubert varieties, along with some examples and basic properties. The formulas for Hilbert series and multiplicities at cominuscule points are contained in 6.2, following some preliminaries about Weyl groups. Section 6.3 describes the tangent spaces to the slices at T-fixed points in terms of the tangent spaces of the Schubert varieties. Since the latter have been described combinatorially in classical cases, this gives a description of the tangent spaces to the slices, which can be used to determine whether a particular point is cominuscule or not. Section 6.4 gives a simple description of the set of weights of tangent lines to T-invariant curves at T-fixed points in the slices in terms of the Bruhat order. In type A, this set is particularly interesting since it coincides with the set of weights of the Zariski tangent space of the slice. Section 6.5 shows that in type A, a cominuscule point in a Schubert variety is necessarily cominuscule in certain smaller Schubert varieties. Section 6.6 shows that cominuscule elements of Weyl groups give rise to cominuscule points (Proposition 6.30); this is a simple consequence of an observation from [Knu09]. In type A, the Weyl group is the symmetric group S_n, and as noted in [Knu09], the cominuscule elements are the 321-avoiding elements. Thus, cominuscule elements of Weyl groups yield a large number of cominuscule points in Schubert varieties, which are not derived from Schubert varieties in cominuscule flag varieties. In the setting of cominuscule Weyl group elements, the Hilbert series and multiplicity formulas that emerge (see Theorem 6.32) are almost the same as the formulas for cominuscule flag varieties given in [GK15]. Finally, in Section 7 we compute some examples of multiplicities and Hilbert series at cominuscule points.

2. Notation and preliminaries

2.1. **Cones.** We work with schemes of finite type over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{F}$. Given a (finite-dimensional) vector space V over $\mathbb{F}$, $S(V)$ denotes the symmetric algebra of V, that is, the ring of polynomials on V^*. Our basic reference for intersection theory is [Ful84]. Given a scheme X, $A_i(X)$ denotes the i-th Chow group of X, and $A^*(X)$ denotes the operational Chow ring of X. We write $h = c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V)}(1)) \in A^1(\mathbb{P}(V))$. We abuse notation by using the same letter h for different projective spaces. In particular,

if $i : \mathbb{P}(W) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(V)$ is induced by the inclusion of a subspace, then we write $i^*h = h$. A cone C is a subscheme of V which is invariant under the action of the multiplicative group $\mathbb{G}_m$. If C is a closed cone in V of pure dimension, and k is the codimension of C in V, then $[\mathbb{P}(C)] = dh^k[\mathbb{P}(V)] \in A_*(\mathbb{P}(V))$, where the integer d is the degree of $\mathbb{P}(C)$ in $\mathbb{P}(V)$. We will sometimes simply call d the degree of the cone C (omitting reference to the vector space V). Observe that if V' is another vector space, the degree of C in V is equal to the degree of $C \times V'$ in $V \times V'$. Indeed, the inclusion $V = V \times \{0\} \hookrightarrow V \times V'$ induces a closed embedding $i : \mathbb{P}(V) \to \mathbb{P}(V \times V')$. The scheme-theoretic intersection of $\mathbb{P}(V \times \{0\})$ and $\mathbb{P}(C \times V')$ is equal to $\mathbb{P}(C \times \{0\})$, so $i^*[\mathbb{P}(C \times V')] = [\mathbb{P}(C)]$. Since $i^*(dh^k \cap [\mathbb{P}(V \times V')]) = dh^k \cap [\mathbb{P}(V)]$, the assertion follows.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $V = V_1 \times V_2$ be the product of vector spaces V_1 and V_2, and let $C = C_1 \times C_2$, where C_i is a closed cone in V_i ($i = 1, 2$) of pure dimension. Let d, d_1 and d_2 denote the degrees of the cones C, C_1 and C_2, respectively. Then $d = d_1 d_2$.*

Proof. The scheme-theoretic intersection of $\mathbb{P}(C_1 \times V_2)$ and $\mathbb{P}(V_1 \times C_2)$ in $\mathbb{P}(V_1 \times V_2)$ is $\mathbb{P}(C_1 \times C_2)$. Since this intersection is proper, the intersection product $[\mathbb{P}(C_1 \times V_2)][\mathbb{P}(V_1 \times C_2]$ is equal to $[\mathbb{P}(C_1 \times C_2)]$, which implies that the degree of $C_1 \times C_2$ is the product of the degrees of $C_1 \times V_2$ and $V_1 \times C_2$. By the discussion preceding the lemma this equals $d_1 d_2$. □

Remark 2.2. The assertion

$$\mathbb{P}(C_1 \times V_2) \cap \mathbb{P}(V_1 \times C_2) = \mathbb{P}(C_1 \times C_2). \tag{2.1}$$

in the preceding proof can be verified as follows. Since the assertion is local, it suffices to check it on an open cover of $\mathbb{P}(V_1 \times V_2)$. We can cover $\mathbb{P}(V_1 \times V_2)$ by open sets of the form $x \neq 0$, where x is a coordinate function on V_k, for $k = 1, 2$. On such a set (in case $k = 1$, with an analogous statement if $k = 2$), verifying (2.1) is equivalent to verifying the statement

$$(C_1' \times V_2) \cap (V_1' \times C_2) = C_1' \times C_2,$$

where V_1' is the subset of V_1 defined by the equation $x = 1$, and $C_1' = C_1 \cap V_1'$. This, in turn, is a special case of the more general assertion that if X_k is a closed subscheme of M_k (for $k = 1, 2$), then

$$(X_1 \times M_2) \cap (M_1 \times X_2) = X_1 \times X_2. \tag{2.2}$$

To verify (2.2), we may assume $M_k = \operatorname{Spec} A_k$ is affine, and that $I_k \subset A_k$ is the ideal of X_k. The ideal of $(X_1 \times M_2) \cap (M_1 \times X_2)$ in $M_1 \times M_2$ is $J = I_1 \otimes A_2 + A_1 \otimes I_2$. The natural map $(A_1 \otimes A_2)/J \to A_1/I_1 \otimes A_2/I_2$ is an isomorphism, as can be seen by arguing as in the proof of Proposition 2.3 below (by writing $A_k = I_k \oplus V_k$, etc). Equation (2.2) follows.

2.2. **The tangent cone, multiplicities and Hilbert series.** Given a closed point x in a scheme X, the tangent cone C_xX is defined as follows. Working locally, we may assume $X = \operatorname{Spec} A$. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal corresponding to x. The Zariski tangent space is $T_xX = \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$. Then $C_xX = \operatorname{Spec}(\operatorname{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}}A)$, where $\operatorname{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}}A = \oplus_i \mathfrak{m}^i/\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}$. There is a surjection $S(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2) \to \operatorname{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}}A$, so C_xX is a closed cone in T_xX, and the multiplicity $\operatorname{mult}(X,x)$ is the degree of this cone.

The Hilbert function is the function $n \mapsto \dim(\mathfrak{m}^n/\mathfrak{m}^{n+1})$. For sufficiently large values of n it is a polynomial $h(X,x)(n)$ in n, called the Hilbert polynomial; this is related to the multiplicity by the equation $\operatorname{mult}(X,x) = a_d/d!$, where a_d is the leading coefficient of $h(X,x)(n)$. The Hilbert series of X at x is the power series $H(X,x) = \sum \dim(\mathfrak{m}^i/\mathfrak{m}^{i+1})t^i$. Observe that $H(X,x) = H(C_xX,x)$ and $\operatorname{mult}(X,x) = \operatorname{mult}(C_xX,x)$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let X, Y be schemes, and x, y be closed points in X and Y, respectively. Let $z = (x,y) \in X \times Y$. Then*

$$C_z(X \times Y) \cong C_xX \times C_yY. \tag{2.3}$$

Hence

$$H(X \times Y, z) = H(X,x)H(Y,y) \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$\operatorname{mult}(X \times Y, z) = \operatorname{mult}(X,x)\operatorname{mult}(Y,y). \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. We may assume $X = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$, $Y = \operatorname{Spec}(B)$, $X \times Y = \operatorname{Spec}(A \otimes B)$, where A and B are $\mathbb{F}$-algebras and the tensor product is over $\mathbb{F}$. When x, y, and z are viewed as maximal ideals of A, B, and $C = A \otimes B$ rather than points, denote them by $\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}$, and $\mathfrak{p}$ respectively.

We can write $A = V_0 \oplus \mathfrak{m}$, $\mathfrak{m} = V_1 \oplus \mathfrak{m}^2, \ldots$, where each V_i is a subspace of A, and the direct sums are as vector spaces. Thus, we obtain a direct sum decomposition $A = V_0 \oplus V_1 \oplus V_2 \oplus \cdots$, where $\mathfrak{m}^i = V_i \oplus V_{i+1} \oplus \cdots$. Similarly, we can write $B = W_0 \oplus W_1 \oplus W_2 \oplus \cdots$, where $\mathfrak{n}^j = W_j \oplus W_{j+1} \oplus \cdots$. Since $\mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathfrak{n}$ are maximal, V_0 and W_0 are isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}$.

We claim that $\mathfrak{p}$ is equal to the ideal $\mathfrak{m} \otimes B + A \otimes \mathfrak{n}$, which we temporarily denote by $\mathfrak{p}'$. Indeed, let $\pi_1 : X \times Y \to X$ and $\pi_2 : X \times Y \to Y$ denote the projections. Then $\pi_1^* : A \to A \otimes B$ coincides with the map $i_1 : a \mapsto a \otimes 1$. Since the map π_1 is given in terms of ideals by i_1^{-1}, and $\pi_1(z) = x$, we see that $i_1^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{m}$, and therefore $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{m} \otimes \{1\}$. Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is an ideal, $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{m} \otimes B$. Similarly, $\mathfrak{p} \supset A \otimes \mathfrak{n}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{p}'$. On the other hand, as a vector space, $C/\mathfrak{p}'$ is isomorphic to $V_0 \otimes W_0 = \mathbb{F}$, so $\mathfrak{p}'$ is maximal; hence $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}'$ as claimed.

The previous paragraph implies that $\mathfrak{p}^n = \sum_{i+j=n} \mathfrak{m}^i \otimes \mathfrak{n}^j$. If we write $J_n = \oplus_{i+j=n} V_i \otimes W_j$, then $\mathfrak{p}^n = J_n \oplus J_{n+1} \oplus \cdots$.

The homomorphism $i_1 : A \to C$ takes $\mathfrak{m}$ to $\mathfrak{m} \otimes 1 \subset \mathfrak{p}$, and hence induces a homomorphism $\mathrm{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}} A \to \mathrm{gr}_{\mathfrak{p}} C$. Similarly, the homomorphism $i_2 : B \to C$ induces a homomorphism $\mathrm{gr}_{\mathfrak{n}} B \to \mathrm{gr}_{\mathfrak{p}} C$. The tensor product of these is a homomorphism $\phi : \mathrm{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}} A \otimes \mathrm{gr}_{\mathfrak{n}} B \to \mathrm{gr}_{\mathfrak{p}} C$. On the homogeneous component of degree n, ϕ restricts to a map

$$\bigoplus_{i+j=n} (\mathfrak{m}^i/\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}) \otimes (\mathfrak{n}^j/\mathfrak{n}^{j+1}) \to \mathfrak{p}^n/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1}. \tag{2.6}$$

Using the direct sum decompositions of powers of the ideals $\mathfrak{m}$, $\mathfrak{n}$ and $\mathfrak{p}$, each of $\bigoplus_{i+j=n}(\mathfrak{m}^i/\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}) \otimes (\mathfrak{n}^j/\mathfrak{n}^{j+1})$ and $\mathfrak{p}^n/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1}$ can be identified with $\bigoplus_{i+j=n} V_i \otimes W_j$. Under these identifications the map (2.6) is the identity map. Hence ϕ is an isomorphism, and therefore induces an isomorphism $C_z(X \times Y) \to C_x X \times C_y Y$. Moreover, the dimension of the left (resp. right) side of (2.6) is equal to the coefficient of t^n in $H(X, x)H(Y, y)$ (resp. $H(X \times Y, z)$). Hence $H(X, x)H(Y, y) = H(X \times Y, z)$.

Finally, the statement about multiplicities says that the degree of $\mathbb{P}(C_z(X \times Y))$ as a subscheme of $\mathbb{P}(V_1^* \oplus V_2^*)$ is equal to the product of the degrees of $\mathbb{P}(C_x X)$ and $\mathbb{P}(C_y Y)$ as subschemes of $\mathbb{P}(V_1^*)$ and $\mathbb{P}(V_2^*)$. Since $C_z(X \times Y) \cong C_x X \times C_y Y$, this follows from Lemma 2.1. □

2.3. **Tori, completions, and evaluation maps.** Let $T \cong (\mathbb{G}_m)^n$ be a torus. We write $\hat{T} = \mathrm{Hom}(T, \mathbb{G}_m)$ for the character group of T. We will usually write $\hat{T}$ additively, and view it as a subset of the dual $\mathfrak{t}^*$ of the Lie algebra of T. We identify $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{G}_m, T)$ with the set of $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that $\lambda(v) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\lambda \in \hat{T}$; we will say that such a v is integral. If $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ satisfies $\lambda(v) \in \mathbb{Q}$ for all $\lambda \in \hat{T}$, we say v is rational. When we wish to view $\lambda \in \hat{T}$ as a homomorphism $T \to \mathbb{G}_m$ we will write it as e^λ.

We write $\mathbb{F}_\lambda$ for the 1-dimensional representation of T of weight λ (that is, on which T acts by e^λ). If V is a representation of T, we denote by $\Phi(V) \subset \hat{T}$ the set of weights of T on V. Note that if $T = \mathbb{G}_m$, then $\hat{T} \cong \mathbb{Z}$, where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ corresponds to the homomorphism sending $t \to t^n$.

Let $R(T)$ be the representation ring of T; this is the free $\mathbb{Z}$-module with basis e^λ, for $\lambda \in \hat{T}$, and multiplication given by $e^\lambda e^\mu = e^{\lambda+\mu}$. Let $S(\hat{T})$ be the symmetric algebra on $\hat{T}$; if $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ is a basis for $\hat{T} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$, then $S(\hat{T})$ is the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n]$.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose S is a finite subset of $\hat{T}$, and suppose that $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ satisfies $\alpha(v) \in \mathbb{Q}$ for all $\alpha \in S$. Then there exists a rational element v' of $\mathfrak{t}$ such that $\alpha(v') = \alpha(v)$ for all $\alpha \in S$.*

Proof. Let M be the lattice $\hat{T} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$, and N the dual lattice $M^\vee \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$. Write $M_\mathbb{Q} = M \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ and $N_\mathbb{Q} = N \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. Let $M_{S,\mathbb{Q}}$ be the subspace of $M_\mathbb{Q} = M \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ spanned by the elements of S. The element v defines an element f_v of the dual space $M_{S,\mathbb{Q}}^*$. The inclusion $M_{S,\mathbb{Q}} \to M_\mathbb{Q}$ leads to a surjection $N_\mathbb{Q} \to M_{S,\mathbb{Q}}^*$ of dual spaces. Therefore,

there exists v' in $N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ mapping to f_v. Since $N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ can be viewed as a subset of $\mathfrak{t}$, this v' is our desired element of $\mathfrak{t}$. □

Let $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ be rational, and let d be a positive integer such that dv is integral. For $i \in \frac{1}{d}\mathbb{Z}$, let $R^i(T)$ be the span of e^λ with $\lambda(v) = i$. Then $R(T) = \oplus_i R^i(T)$. Let $\hat{R}(T)$ be the completion of $R(T)$ with respect to the ideal of positive degree elements. An element of $\hat{R}(T)$ can be written as a (possibly) infinite sum $\sum r_i$, where $r_i \in R^i(T)$, and the set of i such that $r_i \neq 0$ is bounded below.

If v is integral, define a homomorphism $\mathrm{ev}_v : R(T) \to \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]$ by $\mathrm{ev}_v(e^\lambda) = t^{\lambda(v)}$. We extend this to $\mathrm{ev}_v : \hat{R}(T) \to \mathbb{Z}[t^{-1}][[t]]$ by $\mathrm{ev}_v(\sum r_i) = \sum \mathrm{ev}_v(r_i)$. If v is rational, the same construction works, except that we need to introduce the variable $u = t^{1/d}$; we obtain a map $\mathrm{ev}_v : \hat{R}(T) \to \mathbb{Z}[u^{-1}][[u]]$. Note that if $f, g \in R(T)$ such that g is a unit in $\hat{R}(T)$, then $\mathrm{ev}_v(f/g)$ is the expansion of the rational function $\mathrm{ev}_v(f)/\mathrm{ev}_v(g)$ in positive powers of t (i.e., the Laurent series expansion at $t = 0$, or $u = 0$ in the rational case).

We can also define an evaluation map using $S(\hat{T})$ in place of $R(T)$. Precisely, if $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ is a basis of $\hat{T}$, then $S(\hat{T})$ is the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n]$. If $f(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$ and $g(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$ are in $S(\hat{T})$, define

$$\mathrm{ev}_v\left(\frac{f}{g}\right) = \frac{f(\lambda_1(v), \ldots, \lambda_n(v))}{g(\lambda_1(v), \ldots, \lambda_n(v))} \in \mathbb{Q},$$

provided the denominator is nonzero.

2.4. **Equivariant K-theory and Chow groups for torus actions.** If a torus T acts on a scheme (or variety) X, we call X a T-scheme (or variety). We denote by $K_T(X)$ (resp. $G_T(X)$) the Grothendieck group of T-equivariant vector bundles (resp. coherent sheaves) on X. If X is nonsingular, the natural map $K_T(X) \to G_T(X)$ is an isomorphism (see [Tho87, Cor. 7.8]). The representation ring $R(T)$ is identified with the Grothendieck group $K_T(pt)$ of a point, and $K_T(X)$ is an $R(T)$-module. Similarly, we let $A^T_*(X)$ denote the T-equivariant Chow groups of X (see [EG98]. By definition, $A^T_i(X) = A_{i+N}(\mathcal{U} \times^T X)$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is an open T-invariant subset in a representation $\mathcal{V}$ of T such that the codimension of $\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{U}$ in $\mathcal{V}$ is greater than $\dim X - i$, and $N = \dim \mathcal{V} - \dim T$. We abuse notation and write $X_T = \mathcal{U} \times^T X$, although X_T depends on the choice of a suitable $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{V}$. The ring $S(\hat{T})$ can be identified with the operational Chow ring $A^*_T(pt)$ of a point. This acts on $A^T_*(X)$; by definition, the element $\lambda \in \hat{T}$ acts by multiplication by the first Chern class of the line bundle $\mathcal{U} \times^T (X \times \mathbb{F}_\lambda) \to \mathcal{U} \times^T X$. If T acts freely on X, then flat pullback via the map $q : \mathcal{U} \times^T X \to X/T$ induces an isomorphism $A_i(X/T) \to A^T_i(X)$. A T-equivariant vector bundle V on X has equivariant Chern classes $c^T_i(V)$ in $A^i_T(X)$.

For any point x with a trivial T-action we identify $K_T(\{x\})$ with $R(T)$ and $A^*_T(\{x\})$ with $S(\hat{T})$. Thus, if $i : \{x\} \to X$ is the inclusion of a T-fixed point of a nonsingular

T-variety, we have pullback maps $i^* : K_T(X) \to K_T(\{x\}) = R(T)$ and $i^* : A_*^T(X) \to A_T^*(\{pt\}) = S(\hat{T})$.

Let X be a T-scheme, and Y a closed T-stable subscheme. We denote by $[\mathcal{O}_Y]_X$ and $[Y]_X$ the structure sheaf and equivariant fundamental classes in $G_T(X)$ and $A_*^T(X)$, respectively. If it is understood that we are working in $G_T(X)$ or $A_*^T(X)$, the subscript X is frequently omitted.

If V is a vector space, let $i_V : \{0\} \to V$ denote the inclusion of $\{0\}$ in V. A representation V of T can be viewed as a T-equivariant vector bundle over a point. If $\dim V = d$, then the top equivariant Chern class of V is $c_d^T(V) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi(V)} \alpha \in A_*^T(pt)$. Another important class is $\lambda_{-1}(V^*) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi(V)}(1 - e^{-\alpha}) \in K_T(pt) = R(T)$.

A section of s a line bundle L on a scheme X is regular if the map from $\mathcal{O}_X$ to the sheaf of sections of L given by multiplication by s is injective. This is equivalent to saying that on a trivializing open cover, the functions locally defining the section are not zero-divisors. See [Ful84, Section 14.1] (which in fact deals with general vector bundles).

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose a torus T acts on smooth varieties M_1, M_2, and suppose Y is a closed subscheme of M_2. Let m_i be a T-fixed point of M_i ($i = 1, 2$), and let i_{m_1}, i_{m_2}, and $i_{(m_1,m_2)}$ be the inclusions of m_1, m_2 and (m_1, m_2) into M_1, M_2 and $M_1 \times M_2$, respectively. Then*

$$i_{(m_1,m_2)}^*[\mathcal{O}_{M_1 \times Y}]_{M_1 \times M_2} = i_{m_2}^*[\mathcal{O}_Y]_{M_2}$$

and

$$i_{(m_1,m_2)}^*[M_1 \times Y]_{M_1 \times M_2} = i_{m_2}^*[Y]_{M_2}.$$

Proof. Let $k : \{(m_1, m_2)\} \to \{m_2\}$. Under our identifications of $K_T(\{(m_1, m_2)\})$ and $K_T(\{m_2\})$ with $R(T)$, the K-theory pullback k^* is the identity. Similar remarks apply for equivariant Chow groups.

Let $\pi : M_1 \times M_2$ be projection on the second factor. Then

$$i_{(m_1,m_2)}^* \pi^* = (\pi \circ i_{(m_1,m_2)})^* = (i_{m_2} \circ k)^* = k^* i_{m_2}^* = i_{m_2}^*.$$

Also, $\pi^*([\mathcal{O}_Y]_{M_2}) = [\mathcal{O}_{M_1 \times Y}]_{M_1 \times M_2}$ and $\pi^*([Y]_{M_2}) = [M_1 \times Y]_{M_1 \times M_2}$. Hence,

$$i_{(m_1,m_2)}^*[\mathcal{O}_{M_1 \times Y}]_{M_1 \times M_2} = i_{(m_1,m_2)}^* \pi^*([\mathcal{O}_Y]_{M_2}) = i_{m_2}^*([\mathcal{O}_Y]_{M_2})$$

and

$$i_{(m_1,m_2)}^*[M_1 \times Y]_{M_1 \times M_2} = i_{(m_1,m_2)}^* \pi^*([Y]_{M_2}) = i_{m_2}^*([Y]_{M_2}),$$

as desired. □

Lemma 2.6. *If $\mathcal{L}$ is a T-equivariant line bundle on a T-scheme X, and s is a T-invariant regular section with zero-scheme Y, then $[Y] = c_1^T(\mathcal{L}) \cap [X]$ in $A_*^T(X)$, and $[\mathcal{O}_Y] = [\mathcal{O}_X] + [\mathcal{L}]$ in $G_T(X)$.*

Proof. By definition, $A_i^T(X) = A_{i+N}(X_T)$, where X_T and N are as above. The T-equivariant line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ defines a line bundle $\mathcal{L}_T$ on X_T whose zero-scheme is $[Y_T]$. By [Ful84, Prop. 14.1], $[Y_T] = c_1(\mathcal{L}_T) \cap [X_T]$ in $A_*(X_T)$. Since by definition the class $[Y]$ in $A_*^T(X)$ is the class $[Y_T]$ in $A_*(X_T)$, and $c_1^T(\mathcal{L})$ is $c_1(\mathcal{L}_T) \in A^1(X_T)$, we see that $[Y] = c_1^T(\mathcal{L}) \cap [X]$ in $A_*^T(X)$. For the assertion about classes in $G_T(X)$, see [GK08, Remark 6.3]. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let $T \cong \mathbb{G}_m$ and let λ be a generator of $\hat{T}$. Assume T acts on $V = \mathbb{F}^{n+1}$ with all weights equal to $r\lambda$. Let $V^0 = V \setminus \{0\}$.*

(1) *Suppose $r = -1$. Under the isomorphism $A_*^T(V^0) \cong A_*(\mathbb{P}(V))$, the action of $\lambda \in A_T^1(pt)$ on $A_*^T(V^0)$ corresponds to the action of $-h$ on $A_*(\mathbb{P}(V))$, where $h = c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(V)}(1))$.*

(2) *If $C \subset V$ is a closed cone of pure positive dimension, and k is the codimension of C in V, then for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $[\mathbb{P}(C)] = ah^k \cap [\mathbb{P}(V)]$ in $A_*(\mathbb{P}(V))$ and $[C] = ar^k\lambda^k \cap [V]$ in $A_*^T(V)$.*

Proof. (1) The element $\lambda \in A_T^1(pt)$ acts on $A_*^T(V^0)$, and hence, using the isomorphism $A_*^T(V^0) \cong A_*(\mathbb{P}(V))$, λ acts on $A_*(\mathbb{P}(V))$. This action on $A_*(\mathbb{P}(V))$ is multiplication by the first Chern class of the line bundle $(V^0 \times \mathbb{F}_\lambda)/T \to V^0/T = \mathbb{P}(V)$. To prove that the action of λ corresponds to the action of $-h$, To prove this, it suffices to show that this line bundle is isomorphic to the tautological subbundle S of the trivial bundle $V \times \mathbb{P}(V) \to \mathbb{P}(V)$, since $c_1(S) = -h$. Let $[v]$ (resp. $[v, z]$) denote the class of $v \in V^0$ in $V^0/T = \mathbb{P}(V)$ (resp. the class of $(v, z) \in V^0 \times \mathbb{F}_\lambda$ in $(V^0 \times \mathbb{F}_\lambda)/T$). The map $V^0 \times \mathbb{F}_\lambda \to S$ taking (v, z) to $(zv, [v])$ is constant on T-orbits, since T acts on $V^0 \times \mathbb{F}_\lambda$ by $t(v, z) = (e^{-\lambda}(t)v, e^\lambda(t)z)$. The induced map $(V^0 \times \mathbb{F}_\lambda)/T \to S$ is an isomorphism of bundles on $\mathbb{P}(V)$, as can be verified by working on a trivialization. Hence the action of λ corresponds to the action of $-h$.

(2) First assume $r = -1$. Since the codimension k Chow group of $\mathbb{P}(V)$ is generated by $h^k \cap [\mathbb{P}(V)]$, we have $[\mathbb{P}(C)] = ah^k[\mathbb{P}(V)]$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. Write $C^0 = C \setminus \{0\}$. Under the isomorphism of $A_*^T(V_0)$ with $A_*(\mathbb{P}(V))$, the class $[C^0]$ corresponds to $[\mathbb{P}(C)]$, and we just proved that the action of λ corresponds to the action of $-h$. Hence, $[C^0] = (-1)^k a\lambda^k[V^0]$ in $A_*^T(V^0)$. Now, $A_*^T(V) = S(\hat{T}) \cap [V]$. The restriction map $A_*^T(V) \to A_*^T(V^0)$ gives an isomorphism in degree $n + 1 - k$, as follows from the exact sequence

$$A_*^T(\{0\}) \to A_T^*(V) \to A_T^*(V^0) \to 0.$$

The restriction map takes $[C]$ in $A_{n+k-1}^T(V)$ to $[C^0]$ in $A_{n+k-1}^T(V^0)$. Since the restriction map is an $S(\hat{T})$-module homomorphism taking $[V]$ to $[V_0]$, the equation $[C^0] = (-1)^k a\lambda^k[V^0]$ implies $[C] = (-1)^k a\lambda^k[V]$. This proves (2) in the case $r = -1$.

We now consider the general case, where T acts on V with all weights equal to $r\lambda$. We identify T with $\mathbb{G}_m$ so that $e^\lambda(t) = t$. Let $T_1 = \mathbb{G}_m$ with $\lambda_1 \in \hat{T}_1$ defined so that $e^{\lambda_1}(t) = t$, and let T_1 act on V with all weights equal to $-\lambda_1$. Define $T \to T_1$ by

$t \mapsto t^{-r}$. This induces a pullback map $\hat{T}_1 \to \hat{T}$ taking λ_1 to $-r\lambda$. This extends to a map from $S(\hat{T}_1) = \mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1] = A^*_{T_1}(pt)$ to $S(\hat{T}) = \mathbb{Z}[\lambda] = A^*_T(pt)$.

The T-action on V is induced from the T_1-action by the map $T \to T_1$. Hence, the closed T-invariant subschemes of V are the same as the closed T_1-invariant subschemes. If Y is such a subscheme, write $[Y]_T$ (resp. $[Y]_{T_1}$) for the fundamental class of Y in $A^T_*(V)$ (resp. $A^*_{T_1}(V)$). If Y is a T-invariant closed subvariety of V and f is a rational function on Y which is a weight vector for T (and equivalently for T_1), the divisor of f defines classes $[\mathrm{Div}_Y(f)]_T$ and $[\mathrm{Div}_Y(f)]_{T_1}$ in $A^*_T(V)$ and $A^*_{T_1}(V)$, respectively. Moreover,

$$[\mathrm{Div}_Y(f)]_T = \sum_i n_i[Y_i]_T \ \text{ iff } \ [\mathrm{Div}_Y(f)]_{T_1} = \sum_i n_i[Y_i]_{T_1}, \tag{2.7}$$

as the coefficient n_i is the order of vanishing f along Y_i (cf. [Ful84, Section 1.2]), and this does not depend on the torus.

A theorem of Brion ([Bri97, Theorem 2.1]) implies that the $S(\hat{T}_1)$-module $A^*_{T_1}(V)$ is defined by generators $[Y]_{T_1}$, where Y is a closed T-invariant subvariety of V, and relations $[\mathrm{Div}_Y(f)]T_1 + \chi_1[Y]$, where f is a rational function on Y which is a T_1-weight vector of weight χ_1. (The sign here is opposite of that in [Bri97], since we are following the convention of [Gra01]; see footnote 2 of that paper.) The analogous result for the $S(\hat{T})$-module $A^*_T(V)$ also holds.

By hypothesis, T_1 acts on V with all weights equal to $-\lambda_1$. Hence, by what we have already proved, the equation $[\mathbb{P}(C)] = ah^k[\mathbb{P}(V)]$ implies

$$[C]_{T_1} = (-1)^k a\lambda_1^k[V]_{T_1}. \tag{2.8}$$

It suffices to show that this equation implies

$$[C]_T = ar^k\lambda_1^k[V]_T. \tag{2.9}$$

Brion's presentation of $A^{T_1}_*(V)$ and (2.8) imply that in the free $S(\hat{T}_1)$-module with basis consisting of the fundamental classes of T_1-invariant subvarieties of V, we have

$$[C]_{T_1} - (-1)^k a\lambda_1^k[V]_{T_1} + \sum_i s_i(\lambda_1)\Big(\sum_j n_{ij}[Y_{ij}]_{T_1} + b_i\lambda_1[Y_i]_{T_1}\Big) = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

Here, in the above expression, each $s_i(\lambda_1) \in \mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1]$ is a polynomial, Y_i is a T-invariant closed subvariety of V, f_i is a rational function on Y_i which is a T-weight vector of weight $b_i\lambda_1$, and

$$[\mathrm{Div}_{Y_i}(f_i)]_{T_1} = \sum_j n_{ij}[Y_{ij}]_{T_1}. \tag{2.11}$$

We claim that in the free $S(\hat{T})$-module generated by the fundamental classes $[Y]_T$, the following equation holds.

$$[C]_T - r^k a\lambda^k[V]_T + \sum_i s_i(-d\lambda)\Big(\sum_j n_{ij}[Y_{ij}]_T - b_i d\lambda[Y_i]_T\Big) = 0. \tag{2.12}$$

(This equation is obtained from (2.10) by substituting $-r\lambda$ for λ_1 and replacing T_1-equivariant fundamental classes with the corresponding T-equivariant classes.) The reason is that when we collect terms on the left hand side of (2.10), the coefficient of any $[Z]_{T_1}$ is obtained by adding polynomials $u_1(\lambda_1), u_2(\lambda_1), \ldots, u_r(\lambda_1)$; the equality in (2.10) is the statement that as polynomials, $\sum_k u_k(\lambda_1) = 0$. On the left hand side of (2.12), the coefficient of $[Z]_T$ is $\sum_k u_k(-d\lambda)$, which again equals 0 as a polynomial. This proves the claim.

Since f_i is a T_1-weight vector of weight $b_i\lambda_1$, it is a T-weight vector of $-b_i d\lambda$. Also, (2.7) and (2.11) imply that

$$[\mathrm{Div}_{Y_i}(f_i)]_T = \sum_j n_{ij}[Y_{ij}]_T. \tag{2.13}$$

Therefore, Brion's presentation of $A^T_*(X)$ and(2.12) imply that in $A^T_*(X)$,

$$[C]_T - r^k a \lambda_1^k [V]_T = 0,$$

completing the proof. □

3. Generalized cominuscule points

Suppose X is a closed T-invariant subscheme of a nonsingular T-variety M. Let $[\mathcal{O}_X]$ and $[X]$ denote the classes in $K_T(M)$ and $A^*_T(M)$, respectively. Let $x \in X^T$, and suppose there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi(T_xM)$. Then

$$H(X,x) = \frac{\mathrm{ev}_v(i^*[\mathcal{O}_X])}{(1-t)^d} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{mult}(X,x) = \mathrm{ev}_{-v}(i^*[X]). \tag{3.1}$$

These formulas were used by Ikeda-Naruse and Graham-Kreiman to study Schubert varieties; see [IN09, Prop. 9.1] and [GK15, Cor. 2.11]).

In this section we obtain analogues of these formulas under a weaker tangent space hypothesis. Precisely, we define the notion of a generalized cominuscule point of a scheme with a torus action, and prove formulas for the Hilbert series and multiplicity at a generalized cominuscule point (see Theorem 3.10).

3.1. **Degenerating to the tangent cone.** Let V be a representation of a torus T. Let V^* denote the dual representation of T, so the symmetric algebra $S(V^*)$ is the ring of regular functions on V. Let $X = \operatorname{Spec} A$ be a T-invariant closed subscheme of V containing 0, so we have a surjection $S(V^*) \to A$. Let $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$ be the maximal ideal of 0. The tangent cone of X at 0 is $\mathcal{C} = \operatorname{Spec} B$, where $B = \mathrm{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}} A = A/\mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 \oplus \cdots$. There is a T-equivariant surjection $S(V^*) \to B$, so $\mathcal{C}$ is a T-invariant closed subscheme of V. The next proposition shows that under some circumstances, degenerating to the tangent cone does not change the class in equivariant Chow groups or K-theory. This type of result is known, but for lack of a precise reference we provide a proof.

Proposition 3.1. *With the assumptions and notation of the previous paragraph, we have:*

(1) *If X has pure dimension k, then so does $\mathcal{C}$, and $[\mathcal{C}] = [X]$ in $A_k^T(V)$.*

(2) *$[\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}] = [\mathcal{O}_X]$ in $G_T(V)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \cdots \oplus h^{-2}\mathfrak{m}^2 \oplus h^{-1}\mathfrak{m} \oplus A \oplus hA \oplus h^2A \oplus \cdots$ denote the Rees algebra of A (see [Eis95, Section 6.5]). We extend the T-action on A to an action on $\mathcal{A}$ by requiring $t \cdot h^k a = h^k(t \cdot a)$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a \in A$. Let $\mathcal{X} = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{A}$. There is a T-equivariant $\mathbb{F}[h]$-algebra homomorphism $\varphi : S(V^*)[h] \to \mathcal{A}$ characterized by $\varphi(\zeta) = h^{-1}\zeta$ for $\zeta \in V^*$. The algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is spanned by elements of the form $h^{-m}\zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_n = \varphi(h^{n-m}\zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_n)$, where $\zeta_i \in V^*$ and $m \leq n$, so φ is surjective, and hence induces a T-equivariant closed embedding $\mathcal{X} \subset V \times \mathbb{A}^1$. Let $\mathcal{X}_c$ denote the fiber of $\mathcal{X}$ over $c \in \mathbb{A}^1$. The composition $\mathcal{X} \to V \times \mathbb{A}^1 \to V$ is T-equivariant, and it takes $\mathcal{X}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}_0$) isomorphically onto X (resp. $\mathcal{C}$). The fact that if X has pure dimension k, then so does $\mathcal{C}$, is a special case of [Ful84, Appendix B.6.6].

We have a T-equivariant open embedding $V \times \mathbb{A}^1 \subset V \times \mathbb{P}^1$ (where T acts trivially on $\mathbb{P}^1$). There is a closed subscheme $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ of $V \times \mathbb{P}^1$ such that $\overline{\mathcal{X}} \cap (V \times \mathbb{A}^1)$ equals $\mathcal{X}$ as a scheme. This means that under the map $\pi : \overline{\mathcal{X}} \to \mathbb{P}^1$, the inverse image of $\mathbb{A}^1$ is $\mathcal{X}$. Thus, if $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_c$ denotes the fiber of $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ over $c \in \mathbb{P}^1$, then if $c \in \mathbb{A}^1$, we have $\mathcal{X}_c = \overline{\mathcal{X}}_c$.

There are sections s_0 and s_1 of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$ whose zero-schemes are the points 0 and 1, respectively. These sections are T-invariant since T acts trivially on $\mathbb{P}^1$. The pullbacks π^*s_0 and π^*s_1 are T-invariant regular sections of $\pi^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$ whose zero-schemes are $\mathcal{X}_0$ and $\mathcal{X}_1$, respectively. Lemma 2.6 implies that in $A_k^T(\overline{\mathcal{X}})$, $[\mathcal{X}_0]$ and $[\mathcal{X}_1]$ are each equal to $c_1^T(\pi^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)) \cap [\overline{\mathcal{X}}]$, which implies $[\mathcal{X}_0] = [\mathcal{X}_1]$. Let p denote the composition $\overline{\mathcal{X}} \to V \times \mathbb{P}^1 \to V$. Then p is proper, and it takes $\mathcal{X}_0$ isomorphically onto $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{X}_1$ isomorphically onto X. Thus,

$$[\mathcal{C}] = p_*[\mathcal{X}_0] = p_*[\mathcal{X}_1] = [X],$$

proving (1). Similarly, in $G_T(\overline{\mathcal{X}})$, we have $[\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_0}] = [\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_1}]$, since by Lemma 2.6, each is equal to $[\mathcal{O}_{\overline{\mathcal{X}}}] + [\pi^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)]$. Applying p_* yields $[\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}] + p_*[\pi^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)] = [\mathcal{O}_X] + p_*[\pi^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)]$, so $[\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}] = [\mathcal{O}_X]$ in $G_T(V)$, proving (2). □

Remark 3.2. The existence of $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ as in the previous proof can be verified as follows. Cover $\mathbb{P}^1$ with open sets U_0, U_1 isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}^1$ such that $\mathcal{X} \subset V \times \mathbb{A}^1 = V \times U_0$. Write $U_{01} = U_0 \cap U_1$. To define $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$, it suffices to define a closed subscheme $\mathcal{X}' \subset V \times U_1$ such that $\mathcal{X}' \cap (V \times U_{01}) = \mathcal{X} \cap (V \times U_{01})$ as schemes. The closed subscheme $\mathcal{X} \cap (V \times U_{01})$ of $V \times U_{01} = \operatorname{Spec} S(V^*)[h, h^{-1}]$ is defined by an ideal I. Define $J = I \cap S(V^*)[h^{-1}]$, and let $\mathcal{X}'$ be the closed subscheme of $V \times U_1$ defined by the ideal J. Then $\mathcal{X}' \cap (V \times U_{01})$ is defined by the ideal $J[h] = I$, as desired.

Recalll that if V is a vector space, i_V denotes the inclusion of $\{0\}$ into V.

Proposition 3.3. *Keep the notation and hypotheses of Proposition 3.1. Suppose $k : V_1 \hookrightarrow V$ is the inclusion of a T-invariant subspace such that all the weights of T on V/V_1 are nonzero, and suppose that V_1 contains $\mathcal{C}$. Let $d = \dim V$ and $d_1 = \dim V_1$.*

(1) $i_{V_1}^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_{V_1}) = \frac{i_V^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_V)}{\lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*)} = \frac{i_V^*([\mathcal{O}_X]_V)}{\lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*)}$.

(2) $i_{V_1}^*([\mathcal{C}]_{V_1}) = \frac{i_V^*([\mathcal{C}]_V)}{c_{d-d_1}^T(V/V_1)} = \frac{i_V^*([X]_V)}{c_{d-d_1}^T(V/V_1)}$.

Proof. We have

$$i_V^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_V) = i_V^* k_*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_{V_1}) = i_{V_1}^* k^* k_*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_{V_1}). \tag{3.2}$$

The normal bundle of V_1 in V is the bundle $V_1 \times (V/V_1) \to V_1$, which is trivial, but not equivariantly trivial. The self-intersection formula in equivariant K-theory implies that k^*k_* is multiplication by $\lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*)$ (see e.g. [EG05, Section 3.1]). Hence the right side of (3.2) equals $i_{V_1}^*(\lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*)[\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_{V_1})$. Since $i_{V_1}^*$ is an $R(T)$-module map, this equals $\lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*) i_{V_1}^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_{V_1})$. Therefore,

$$i_V^*[\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_V = \lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*) i_{V_1}^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_{V_1}). \tag{3.3}$$

Dividing by $\lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*)$, and using the equality $[\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_V = [\mathcal{O}_X]_V$, proves (1). The proof of (2) is similar, using the fact that in equivariant Chow groups, the self-intersection formula implies that k^*k_* is multiplication by $c_{d-d_1}^T(V/V_1)$. □

Note that in the above proposition, the equality of (1) is to be interpreted as equality in $R(T)$, and the equality of (2) as equality in $A_*^T(pt)$. There is no need to localize (i.e. invert elements): statement (1) implies that $i^*[\mathcal{O}_X]$ is divisible by $\lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*)$, and statement (2) implies that $i^*[X]$ is divisible by $c_{d-d_1}(V/V_1)$.

3.2. **Generalized cominuscule points of schemes.**

Definition 3.4. Suppose X is a closed T-invariant subscheme of a nonsingular T-variety M. A point $x \in X^T$ is said to be a generalized cominuscule point of X if there are

(1) Representations V' and V of T, such that all the weights of T on V are nonzero, and an isomorphism of $V' \times V$ with an open subscheme M_0 of M containing x. Let $X_0 = X \cap M_0$.

(2) A T-invariant subscheme $\mathcal{N}$ of V, called a slice, such that the isomorphism of (1) restricts to an isomorphism of $V' \times \mathcal{N}$ with X_0. We identify $\mathcal{N}$ with $\{0\} \times \mathcal{N}$ and via $V' \times \mathcal{N} \cong X_0$ we view $\mathcal{N}$ as a subscheme of X_0, and x as a point of $\mathcal{N}$.

(3) A rational element $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that for each weight α of T on the Zariski tangent space $T_x\mathcal{N}$, we have $\alpha(v) = -1$.

In our main example, where X is a Schubert variety, $\mathcal{N}$ will be a slice to X with respect to the action of a unipotent group. This motivates our use of the term slice

in this more general setting. In the Schubert case, the unipotent group, which is isomorphic as a variety to its Lie algebra, plays the role of the vector space V'.

Remark 3.5. It is convenient in (3) to assume that v is rational since the proof we give of Theorem 3.10 uses this hypothesis, so putting rationality into the definition makes it unnecessary to restate later. However, the rationality assumption on v in (3) is not a genuine restriction. By Lemma 2.4, if we have a nonrational $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ with $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi(T_x\mathcal{N})$, we can find a rational v' also satisfying $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi(T_x\mathcal{N})$, so by replacing v by v' we can assume v is rational. Therefore, in checking whether a point is generalized cominuscule, it suffices to find a $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ with $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi(T_x\mathcal{N})$; we do not have to verify that v is rational.

Remark 3.6. If we are in the situation of the beginning of Section 3—that is, X is a closed T-invariant subscheme of a nonsingular T-variety M, $x \in X^T$, and there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi(T_xM)$—then x is a generalized cominuscule point of X. Indeed, [Bri99, Prop. A2] implies that there is a neighborhood of x in M isomorphic to $V = T_xM$, so taking $V' = 0$ and $\mathcal{N} = X_0$, the hypotheses of Definition 3.4 are satisfied. The converse is not true: as we will see in the Schubert setting, there exist generalized cominuscule points which do not arise from the situation of the beginning of Section 3.

Remark 3.7. It is natural to ask why the representation V is part of the data. Indeed, if $\mathcal{N}$ is a scheme with a T-fixed point x, and there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that for each weight α of T on $V_1 = T_x\mathcal{N}$, we have $\alpha(v) = -1$, then there is a T-invariant neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_0$ of x in $\mathcal{N}$ and a T-equivariant embedding of $\mathcal{N}_0$ into V_1 taking x to 0. (This follows by [Bri99, Prop. A2], since all the weights of T on V_1 lie in a half-space. Although Brion's result is stated for a variety, it holds for a scheme as well.) Therefore, we could take $V = V_1$, so it might appear that there is no reason to include V as a separate part of the data. However, in applications, we may have a natural embedding of $\mathcal{N}$ into a vector space V which contains but may differ from V_1, and it may happen that the embedding $\mathcal{N}_0 \to V_1$ is not compatible with the embedding $V_1 \to V$, in the sense that the composition $\mathcal{N}_0 \to V_1 \to V$ is not the original inclusion of $\mathcal{N}_0$ into V. See Example 3.8. Therefore, we have made the representation V part of the data of a generalized cominuscule point.

Example 3.8. Suppose T acts on V, and X is a closed T-stable subvariety of V containing 0. Let $A = S(V^*)$ be the ring of regular functions on V, I the ideal of X, and $B = A/I$, so $V = \operatorname{Spec} A$ and $X = \operatorname{Spec} B$. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of 0 in B and $V_1 = (\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2)^* = T_xX$. The dual of the natural surjection $V^* \to \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ yields an embedding $V_1 \to V$. The tangent cone $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_xX$ is naturally a subscheme of V_1, since by definition $\mathcal{C} = \operatorname{Spec} \operatorname{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}} B$, and the surjection $S(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2) \to \operatorname{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}} B$ yields $\mathcal{C} \to V_1$.

If all weights of T on V_1 lie in a half-space, then there is a closed embedding $X \to V_1$. The following example shows (as asserted in the previous remark) that this embedding

need not be compatible with the embedding of X into V. Let $T = \mathbb{G}_m$ act on $V = \mathbb{A}^2$ with weights 1 and 2, so that $v = (1, 0)$ and $w = (0, 1)$ are weight vectors of weights 1 and 2, respectively. Let $\{x, y\}$ be the basis of V^* dual to the basis $\{v, w\}$, so x and y are T-weight vectors of weights -1, -2. Let $A = S(V^*) = \mathbb{F}[x, y]$. Let X be the subvariety of $\mathbb{A}^2$ defined by the equation $x^2 = y$, so $X = \operatorname{Spec} B$ with $B = \mathbb{F}[x, y]/\langle x^2 - y\rangle$, and let $\overline{x}, \overline{y}$ denote the images of x, y in B. The surjection $V^* \to \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ takes x to a basis element and y to 0, so the dual map $V_1 \to V$ identifies V_1 with its image $\mathbb{F} \cdot v$. Let $W = \mathbb{F} \cdot \overline{x}$, so $\mathfrak{m} = W \oplus \mathfrak{m}^2$ and $W \cong \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ as representations of T. Since W generates B as a ring, there is a surjection $S(W) \to B$ and this yields the embedding $X \to W^* \cong V_1$ constructed by Brion. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \to & V_1 & \to & V \\ (a, a^2) & \mapsto & av & \mapsto & (a, 0). \end{array}$$

The composition is not the inclusion of X into V, because it does not take the point (a, a^2) to itself. In this example, the tangent cone is the subspace V_1 of V. Note that X is not a dilation-invariant subscheme of V (although of course the tangent cone V_1 is). Also, note that in this example that 0 is a generalized cominuscule point of X.

Remark 3.9. We can generalize Definition 3.4 in several ways. For example, we could replace the point 0 in V' with a T-fixed point in a smooth T-variety (with appropriate changes to the other conditions of the definition). This might be useful in considering slices with respect to actions of groups which are not unipotent. However, for our application to Schubert varieties, we do not need this generality.

Theorem 3.10 below, which generalizes [IN09, Prop. 9.1] and [GK15, Cor. 2.11]), gives formulas for Hilbert series and multiplicities at a generalized cominuscule point in terms of the restriction of K-theory and Chow classes to that point. The motivation for a statement of this form—in which the slice $\mathcal{N}$ does not explicitly appear—is that in the case of Schubert varieties, the restrictions $i_x^*[X]$ and $i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_X]$ will be restrictions of Schubert classes, which can be calculated. This gives a method of calculating Hilbert series and multiplicities of Schubert varieties at cominuscule points.

In this paper, we have chosen to give a proof of the multiplicity formula using equivariant Chow groups but not using equivariant K-theory, unlike the proofs in [IN09] and [GK15]. Also, in the situation of the theorem, it may happen that $\mathrm{ev}_v(\lambda_{-1}(V^*))$ and $\mathrm{ev}_{-v}(c_d(V))$ are 0. However, the terms which produce 0 can be canceled in both numerator and denominator, so the evaluations are defined. In the case of Schubert varieties, we show in the sequel [GK17] that these cancellations can be explicitly described, so our formulas can be applied. See Remarks 3.11 and 6.15 for further discussion.

Theorem 3.10. *Suppose that x is a generalized cominuscule point of X as in Definition 3.4, and adopt the notation of that definition. Let $d' = \dim V'$ and $d = \dim V$. Let $i_x : \{x\} \to M$ be the inclusion, and let $[\mathcal{O}_X]$ and $[X]$ denote classes in $K_T(M)$ and*

$A_*^T(M)$, *respectively. The Hilbert series* $H(X,x)$ *is given by*

$$H(X,x) = \frac{1}{(1-t)^{d'}} \operatorname{ev}_v \Big(\frac{i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_X]}{\lambda_{-1}(V^*)} \Big). \tag{3.4}$$

The multiplicity $\operatorname{mult}(X,x)$ *is given by*

$$\operatorname{mult}(X,x) = \operatorname{ev}_{-v} \Big(\frac{i_x^*[X]}{c_d^T(V)} \Big). \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. Since the Hilbert series and tangent cone are defined locally, as are the pullbacks to the K-theory and Chow groups of $\{x\}$, we may assume that $M = M_0 = V' \times V$ and $X = X_0 = V' \times \mathcal{N}$. Then i_x is the inclusion $i_{V' \times V}$ of 0 into $V' \times V$, $[\mathcal{O}_X]$ is $[\mathcal{O}_X]_{V' \times V}$, and $[X]$ is $[X]_{V' \times V}$.

Let $V_1 = T_x\mathcal{N} \subset V$, and let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the tangent cone to $\mathcal{N}$ at x. Proposition 2.3 implies that

$$H(X,x) = H(V', \{0\}) H(\mathcal{N}, x).$$

We have $H(V', \{0\}) = 1/(1-t)^{d'}$. Also, as observed in Section 2.2, $H(\mathcal{N}, x) = H(\mathcal{C}, x)$. Therefore,

$$H(X,x) = \frac{1}{(1-t)^{d'}} H(\mathcal{C}, x). \tag{3.6}$$

Proposition 2.2 of [GK15] implies that

$$H(\mathcal{C}, x) = \frac{ev_v(i_{V_1}^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_{V_1}))}{(1-t)^{d_1}} = \operatorname{ev}_v \Big(\frac{i_{V_1}^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_{V_1})}{\lambda_{-1}(V_1^*)} \Big). \tag{3.7}$$

By Proposition 3.3, $i_{V_1}^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_{V_1}) = \frac{i_V^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_V)}{\lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*)}$ in $R(T)$. By Proposition 3.1, $[\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_V = [\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{N}]_V$. Hence

$$H(\mathcal{C}, x) = \operatorname{ev}_v \Big(\frac{i_V^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{N}]_V)}{\lambda_{-1}(V_1^*)\lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*)} \Big) = \operatorname{ev}_v \Big(\frac{i_V^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{N}]_V)}{\lambda_{-1}(V^*)} \Big). \tag{3.8}$$

Since $X = V' \times \mathcal{N}$, Lemma 2.5 implies that

$$i_V^*([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{N}]_V) = i_{V' \times V}^*([\mathcal{O}_X]_{V' \times V}).$$

Substituting into (3.8), we find

$$H(\mathcal{C}, x) = \operatorname{ev}_v \Big(\frac{i_{V' \times V}^*([\mathcal{O}_X]_{V' \times V})}{\lambda_{-1}(V^*)} \Big). \tag{3.9}$$

Substituting this into the formula (3.6) for $H(X,x)$ yields the first assertion of the theorem, equation (3.4).

We now turn to the multiplicity formula, equation (3.5). By Proposition 2.3,

$$\operatorname{mult}(X,x) = \operatorname{mult}(V, \{0\}) \operatorname{mult}(\mathcal{N}, x) = \operatorname{mult}(\mathcal{N}, x).$$

By definition, the right hand side is the degree of the projectivized tangent cone $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C})$ in $\mathbb{P}(V_1)$, that is, the integer a such that in $A_*(\mathbb{P}(V_1))$, we have

$$[\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C})] = a h^k \cap [\mathbb{P}(V_1)]. \tag{3.10}$$

We must show that

$$\mathrm{ev}_{-v}\left(\frac{i^*_{V'\times V}([X]_{V'\times V})}{c^T_d(V)}\right) = a.$$

We have

$$i^*_{V'\times V}([X]_{V'\times V}) = i^*_V([\mathcal{N}]_V) = c^T_{d-d_1}(V/V_1)i^*_{V_1}([\mathcal{C}]_{V_1}),$$

where the first equality is by Lemma 2.5, and the second is by Proposition 3.3. Hence

$$\frac{i^*_{V'\times V}([X]_{V'\times V})}{c^T_d(V)} = \frac{i^*_{V_1}([\mathcal{C}]_{V_1})c^T_{d-d_1}(V/V_1)}{c^T_d(V)} = \frac{i^*_{V_1}([\mathcal{C}]_{V_1})}{c^T_{d_1}(V_1)}.$$

Since any weight $\alpha \in \Phi(V_1)$ satisfies $\alpha(-v) = 1$, we have

$$\mathrm{ev}_{-v}\left(\frac{i^*_{V_1}([\mathcal{C}]_{V_1})}{c^T_{d_1}(V_1)}\right) = \mathrm{ev}_{-v}(i^*_{V_1}([\mathcal{C}]_{V_1})), \tag{3.11}$$

and we must show that this equals a. The element v is a rational element of $\mathfrak{t}$; let r be the smallest positive integer such that $-rv$ is an integral element of $\mathfrak{t}$. Let k equal the codimension of $\mathcal{C}$ in V_1. Since $i^*_{V_1}([\mathcal{C}]_{V_1})$ is a homogeneous element of $S(\hat{T})$ of degree k, to show that the right side of (3.11) equals a is equivalent to showing

$$\mathrm{ev}_{-rv}(i^*_{V_1}([\mathcal{C}]_{V_1})) = ar^k. \tag{3.12}$$

Let $T' \cong \mathbb{G}_m$ be the subtorus of T corresponding to the cocharacter rv, and let $v' \in \mathfrak{t}_1$ be the element mapping to $-rv \in \mathfrak{t}$. There is a natural map $\mathrm{res} : \hat{T} \to \hat{T}' = \mathbb{Z}\cdot\lambda$, where $\lambda \in \hat{T}'$ is defined by $\lambda(v') = 1$. This extends to a restriction map $\mathrm{res} : A^*_T(pt) \to A^*_{T'}(pt)$. Also, for any T-scheme Z, there is a restriction map $\mathrm{res} : A^T_*(Z) \to A^{T'}_*(Z)$. The restriction maps are compatible with the functorial operations of equivariant Chow groups, and moreover, given $\xi \in A^*_T(pt)$, we have $\mathrm{ev}_{-rv}(\xi) = \mathrm{ev}_{v'}(\mathrm{res}(\xi))$. Therefore, (3.12) is equivalent to showing

$$\mathrm{ev}_{v'}(i^*_{V_1}([\mathcal{C}]_{V_1,T'})) = ar^k, \tag{3.13}$$

where $[\mathcal{C}]_{V_1,T'}$ denotes the fundamental class of $\mathcal{C}$ in $K_{T'}(V_1)$. Since $\lambda(v') = 1$, this is equivalent to the equation

$$[\mathcal{C}]_{V_1,T'} = ar^k\lambda^k \cap [V_1]. \tag{3.14}$$

Now, T' acts on V_1 with all weights equal to $r\lambda$. Thus, Lemma 2.7 implies that (3.14) is equivalent to our assumption (3.10). This proves (3.14) and completes the proof of the theorem. □

Remark 3.11. If some $\alpha \in \Phi(V)$ satisfies $\alpha(v) = 0$, then $\mathrm{ev}_v(\lambda_{-1}(V^*)) = 0$ and $\mathrm{ev}_{-v}(c^T_d(V)) = 0$. Nevertheless, the evaluations in (3.4) and (3.5) can be carried out. Indeed, the proof of Theorem 3.10 shows that

$$\frac{i^*_x[\mathcal{O}_X]}{\lambda_{-1}(V^*)} = \frac{i^*_{V_1}([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{C}]_{V_1})}{\lambda_{-1}(V_1^*)}, \tag{3.15}$$

since the left hand side is obtained from the right hand side by multiplying numerator and denominator by the common factor

$$\lambda_{-1}((V/V_1)^*) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi(V/V_1)} (1 - e^{-\alpha}).$$

Note that ev_v can be applied to the right hand side of (3.15) since each $\alpha \in \Phi(V_1)$ satisfies $\alpha(v) \neq 0$ (in fact, $\alpha(v) = -1$). However, if one starts out with the formula on the left side of (3.15), to perform the evaluation ev_v, it is necessary first to cancel the common factors of $1 - e^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha(v) = 0$ from the numerator and denominator. This might be nontrivial if one has a complicated expression for $i^*[\mathcal{O}_X]$. But in the case of Schubert varieties, in [GK17], we show that it is possible to explicitly perform this cancellation and apply the formula. Similar remarks apply in the Chow group situation: we have

$$\frac{i_x^*[X]}{c_d^T(V)} = \frac{i_{V_1}^*[\mathcal{C}]_{V_1}}{c_{d_1}^T(V_1)}, \tag{3.16}$$

since the left hand side is obtained from the right hand side by multiplying numerator and denominator by $c_{d-d_1}(V/V_1)$ and ev_{-v} can be applied to the right hand side. Again, in the Schubert case, we show in [GK17] that if one starts with the left hand side of (3.16), the necessary cancellation can be explicitly performed.

Example 3.12. Let $T = \mathbb{G}_m$. Let $\mu : T \to \mathbb{G}_m$ be defined by $e^\mu(t) = t$. Identify $\mathbb{Z}$ with $\hat{T}$ by the map $n \mapsto n\mu$; then $R(T)$ is the span of $e^{n\mu}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $A_T^*(pt)$ is the polynomial ring $\mathbb{F}[\mu]$. Suppose T acts on $V = \mathbb{F}^3$ with all weights equal to -1 (that is, $-\mu$). Define $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ by $\mu(v) = 1$. Let x_1, x_2, x_3 be coordinates on V, let $s = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2$, and let X denote the zero-scheme of s. The origin is a generalized cominuscule point of X, with v and V as above, and $V' = \{0\}$. Write $A = \mathbb{F}[V] = \mathbb{F}[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ and $B = A/\langle s \rangle = \mathbb{F}[X]$. The function s is a weight vector for T with weight 2 (that is, 2μ). The exact sequence

$$0 \to A \otimes F_{2\mu} \xrightarrow{\phi} A \to B \to 0$$

is T-equivariant, where $\phi(a \otimes 1) = sa$. Therefore, in $K_T(V)$, we have $[\mathcal{O}_X] = (1 - e^{2\mu})[\mathcal{O}_V]$, so $i_V^*[\mathcal{O}_X] = (1 - e^{2\mu})$. Since $\lambda_{-1}(V^*) = (1 - e^\mu)^3$, we have

$$\frac{i_V^*[\mathcal{O}_X]}{\lambda_{-1}(V^*)} = \frac{1 + e^\mu}{(1 - e^\mu)^2},$$

and thus

$$H(X, 0) = \mathrm{ev}_v\left(\frac{1 + e^\mu}{(1 - e^\mu)^2}\right) = \frac{1 + t}{1 - t^2}.$$

The Hilbert series formula implies that the multiplicity is 2, but let us obtain this from the Chow group formula of (3.5). Because s is a T-weight vector of weight 2μ, and $[\mathrm{Div}_V(s)]_T = [X]$, the discussion in the proof of Lemma 2.7 implies that $[X] = -2\mu \cap [V]$. Hence $i_V^*[X] = -2\mu$, so

$$\mathrm{mult}(X, 0) = \mathrm{ev}_v(i_V^*[X]) = -2\mu(-v) = 2.$$

Remark 3.13. An alternative way to obtain the formula for $[X]$ from the previous example is by using the formula for $[\mathcal{O}_X]$ and equivariant Riemann-Roch (see [EG00]). (This also serves a check of the above calculations.) In our situation, the equivariant Riemann-Roch theorem gives a map $\tau_V : G_T(V) \to \hat{A}^T_*(V)$, where by definition $\hat{A}^T_*(V)$ is the completion of $A^T_*(V)$ consisting of (possibly infinite) sums of the form $\sum_i \gamma_i$, where $\gamma_i \in A^T_i(V)$ and the sum is over $i \leq \dim V$. If $\gamma \in K_T(V)$, then (with ch denoting the equivariant Chern character, td the equivariant Todd class, and $\mathcal{T}_V$ the tangent sheaf of V), we have

$$\tau_V(\gamma[\mathcal{O}_V]) = \mathrm{ch}(\gamma) \cap \tau_V([\mathcal{O}_V]) = \mathrm{ch}(\gamma)\,\mathrm{td}(\mathcal{T}_V)[V],$$

where the first equality is a general property of Riemann-Roch, and the second is because V is smooth. In this example, $[\mathcal{O}_X] = (1 - e^{2\mu})[\mathcal{O}_V]$, and

$$\tau_V((1-e^{2\mu})[\mathcal{O}_V]) = (1 - (1 + 2\mu + \frac{(2\mu)^2}{2} + \cdots))(1 + \frac{1}{2}c_1(\mathcal{T}_V) + \cdots)[V] = -2\mu[V] + \beta; \tag{3.17}$$

here $-2\mu[V] \in A^T_2(V)$ and β is a sum of terms of degree less than 2. (This can be verified from the definition of the equivariant Riemann-Roch map in [EG00], using [Ful84, Theorem 18.3 (5)].) On the other hand, the map τ_V has the property that

$$\tau_V([\mathcal{O}_X]) = [X] + \beta'; \tag{3.18}$$

here, $[X] \in A^T_2(V)$ and β' is a sum of terms of degree less than 2. Comparing (3.17) and (3.18), we see that the equality $[\mathcal{O}_X] = (1 - e^{2\mu})[\mathcal{O}_V]$ in $G_T(V)$ implies that $[X] = -2\mu[V] \in A^T_2(V)$.

4. Preliminaries on Schubert varieties

4.1. **Background.** In this section we recall basic definitions and facts concerning Schubert varieties. One source for some of these facts is [BL00]. We include some proofs for convenience or for lack of a reference.

We work over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{F}$. Let G be a semisimple algebraic group, and $B \supset T$ a Borel subgroup and maximal torus of G. Let U be the unipotent radical of B, so $B = TU$. The Lie algebra of an algebraic group will be denoted by the corresponding fraktur letter, so that the Lie algebras of these groups are (respectively) $\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{t}$ and $\mathfrak{u}$. Let $B^- = TU^-$ denote the opposite Borel subgroup to B. Let $X = G/B$ denote the flag variety.

Let Φ denote the set of roots of $\mathfrak{t}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$, and let $\Phi^+ = \Phi(\mathfrak{u})$; that is, Φ^+ is the positive system of roots chosen so that the root spaces of $\mathfrak{u}$ correspond to roots in Φ^+. Then $\Phi \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$; the set of coroots $\Phi^\vee$ is a subset of $\mathfrak{t}$ (cf. [Spr09, Section 7.4]). We view the flag variety as $X = G/B$. The Weyl group is $W = N_G(T)/T$, with longest element w_0. We will write x both for an element of W and for a representative in $N_G(T)$, and occasionally for the point $xB \in X$. The points xB are exactly the T-fixed points in X. If H is a subgroup of G normalized by T, and $x \in W$, we will write $H(x) = xHx^{-1}$;

this is independent of the choice of a representative for x in $N_G(T)$. The Lie algebra of $H(x)$ will be denoted $\mathfrak{h}(x) = (\operatorname{Ad} x)(\mathfrak{h})$.

Most of the results that follow are stated for both types of Schubert varieties, namely, the closures of B-orbits and the closures of B^--orbits, so we introduce notation for these. We denote by X_w^0 the Schubert cell $B \cdot wB \subset X$; its closure is the Schubert variety $X_w = \overline{B \cdot wB}$. Similarly, we denote by X_0^w the Schubert cell $B^- \cdot wB \subset X$; and its closure is the opposite Schubert variety $X^w = \overline{B^- \cdot wB}$. We will usually use w as a lower subscript for definitions related to X_w, and as an upper subscript for definitions related to X^w. Since $B = w_0 B^- w_0^{-1}$ and $w_0^2 = 1$, we have $X_w = w_0 X^{w_0 w}$. The Bruhat order is the partial order on W characterized by the property that $X^x \subset X^w$ if and only if $x \geq w$; equivalently, $X_x \subset X_w$ if and only if $x \leq w$. Note that $X^x \subset X^w$ if and only if $xB \in X^w$, and $X_x \subset X_w$ if and only if $xB \in X_w$.

A subgroup P of G containing B is called a standard parabolic subgroup. The quotient $X_P = G/P$ is a generalized flag variety, and the various definitions about Schubert varieties extend to this setting. Let P^- denote the opposite parabolic to P, and let U_P and U_P^- denote the unipotent radicals of P and P^-, respectively. Given a standard parabolic subgroup P, let L be the Levi subgroup of P containing T, so that $P = LU_P$ and $P^- = LU_P^-$. (In general, we will assume without comment that the Levi subgroup of standard parabolic subgroups are the Levi subgroups which contain T.) Write $U_L = U \cap L$ and $U_L^- = U^- \cap L$. By Lemma 5.2, the product map $U_P^- \times U_L^- \to U^-$ is an isomorphism. Similar product map decompositions will be used when we construct slices.

Let W_P denote the Weyl group of L. Let Φ_L denote the set of roots of $\mathfrak{t}$ in $\mathfrak{l}$, and $\Phi_L^+ = \Phi_L \cap \Phi^+$, $\Phi_L^- = -\Phi_L^+$. The T-fixed points of G/P are of the form xP, for $x \in W$; moreover, $xP = yP$ if and only if the cosets xW_P and yW_P are equal.

In each left coset of W_P in W there is a unique element of minimal (resp. maximal) length, characterized by the fact that if x is the minimal length element in its coset, then $x\Phi_L^+ \subset \Phi^+$, and if x is the maximal length element in its coset, then $x\Phi_L^+ \subset \Phi^-$. (The condition $x\Phi_L^+ \subset \Phi^+$ (resp. $x\Phi_L^+ \subset \Phi^-$) is equivalent to the condition $x\alpha > 0$ (resp. $x\alpha < 0$) for all simple roots in Φ_L^+.) This is stated in [Ric92, Lemma 3.3] (which Richardson describes as well-known) and the discussion preceding that lemma. See also [Kos61, Remark 5.13]. By [BGG75, Lemmas 8.10, 8.11], if α is a positive root and $x \in W$, then $x\alpha > 0$ if and only if $xs_\alpha > x$. Hence x is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_P-coset $\Leftrightarrow$ $ws_\alpha > w$ (resp. $ws_\alpha < w$) for all simple roots in Φ_L^+. Finally, again by [Ric92, Lemma 3.3], if w_0 is the longest element of W, the involution of W defined by $y \to w_0 y$ gives an order-reversing bijection between minimal and maximal coset representatives.

Given $w \in W$, there are Schubert cells in X_P defined by $X_{0,P}^w = B^- \cdot wP$ and $X_{w,P}^0 = B \cdot wP$. Their closures in X_P are (respectively) the Schubert varieties $X_P^w =$

$\overline{B^- \cdot wP}$ and $X_{w,P} = \overline{B \cdot wP}$. Although X_P^w and $X_{w,P}$ only depend on the coset of w mod W_P, when dealing with X_P^w (resp. $X_{w,P}$) we will often assume that w is a minimal (resp. maximal) coset representative, since then, by Proposition 4.5 below, $\pi^{-1}(X_P^w) = X^w$ (resp. $\pi^{-1}(X_{w,P}) = X_w$).

Lemma 4.1. *Fix a parabolic subgroup P containing B. If $w = w_M$, then $x \leq w \Leftrightarrow x_M \leq w$. If $w = w_m$, then $x \geq w \Leftrightarrow x_m \geq w$.*

Proof. The first statement follows immediately from [BG03, Lemma 2.8]. The second statement can be deduced from the first using the bijection $y \to w_0 y$, which is order-reversing for the Bruhat order. □

The next lemma shows that $U_P(x)$ and $U_P^-(x)$ only depend on the W_P-coset of x in W.

Lemma 4.2. *Let P be a standard parabolic subgroup. If $x, y \in W$ satisfy $xW_P = yW_P$, then $U_P(x) = U_P(y)$ and $U_P^-(x) = U_P^-(y)$.*

Proof. Since $y = xz$ for some $z \in W_P$, it suffices to show that $U_P(z) = U_P$ and $U_P^-(z) = U_P^-$. Since $z \in W_P$, which is the Weyl group of L, z preserves the subset Φ_L of Φ, and therefore z preserves the complementary subset $\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P) \sqcup \Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-)$. Since the length of z is the same whether viewed as an element of W_P or W [Hum90, Theorem 5.5], z does not change the sign of any root α which is not in Φ_L. Therefore, z preserves each the sets $\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P)$ and $\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-)$. As $\operatorname{Ad} z$ takes the root space $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ to the root space $\mathfrak{g}_{z\alpha}$, we see that $\mathfrak{u}_P(z) = \mathfrak{u}_P$ and $\mathfrak{u}_P^-(z) = \mathfrak{u}_P^-$, so $U_P(z) = U_P$ and $U_P^-(z) = U_P^-$, as desired. □

Knutson [Knu09] observes that if x is minimal in its left W_P-coset, then the projection $G/B \to G/P$ restricts to an isomorphism of Schubert cells $X_x^0 \to X_{x,P}^0$. This is essentially part (1) of the next lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Let P be a standard parabolic subgroup.*

(1) *If x is minimal in its left W_P-coset, then $U^-(x) \cap U = U_P^-(x) \cap U$.*
(2) *If x is maximal in its left W_P-coset, then $U^-(x) \cap U^- = U_P^-(x) \cap U^-$.*

Proof. We prove (1). We have $\Phi^- = \Phi_L^- \cup \Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-)$. If x is minimal, then $x(\Phi_L^-) \subset \Phi^-$, so $x(\Phi^-) \cap \Phi^+ = x(\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-)) \cap \Phi^+$. Since $\mathfrak{u}^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u}$) is spanned by the root spaces corresponding to roots on the left (resp. right) side of this equation, we see that $\mathfrak{u}^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u}$, and therefore $U^-(x) \cap U = U_P^-(x) \cap U$. This proves (1). The proof of (2) is similar, using the fact that if x is maximal, then $x(\Phi_L^-) \subset \Phi^+$. □

4.2. **Projections and Schubert varieties.** Throughout this section, we fix a parabolic P containing B, and consider the behavior of Schubert varieties under the map $\pi : G/B \to G/P$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $w \in W$. Then $\pi(X^w) = X_P^w$ and $\pi(X_w) = \pi(X_{w,P})$.*

Proof. We prove the first statement; the proof of the second is similar. The map π is B^--equivariant, so

$$\pi(X_0^w) = \pi(B^- \cdot wB) = B^- \cdot \pi(wB) = B^- \cdot wP = X_{0,P}^w. \tag{4.1}$$

Since the map π is proper, it is a closed map. Observe that for any closed map $f : X \to Y$, we have $f(\overline{A}) = \overline{f(A)}$. Indeed, the inclusion $\subset$ is equivalent to $\overline{A} \subset f^{-1}(\overline{f(A)})$, which holds because $f^{-1}(\overline{f(A)})$ is a closed set containing A. For the other inclusion, note that because f is closed, $f(\overline{A})$ is a closed set containing $f(A)$, so $f(\overline{A}) \supset \overline{f(A)}$. Applying this observation to (4.1), we obtain

$$\pi(X^w) = \pi(\overline{X_0^w}) = \overline{X_{0,P}^w} = X_P^w,$$

as desired. □

Proposition 4.5. (1) *Let $w \in W$. If w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_P-coset, then $\pi^{-1}(X_P^w) = X^w$ (resp. $\pi^{-1}(X_{w,P}) = X_w$). More generally, $\pi^{-1}(X_P^w) = X_P^{w_m}$ and $\pi^{-1}(X_{w,P}) = X_{w_M,P}$.*

(2) *If X^w (resp.X_w) is the inverse image of a Schubert variety in G/P, then w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its its left W_P-coset, and $\pi^{-1}(X_P^w) = X^w$ (resp. $\pi^{-1}(X_{w,P}) = X_w$).*

Proof. We prove the statements corresponding to X^w; the proof for X_w is similar. We begin with (1). First suppose that w is minimal in its left W_P-coset. Since $X_P^w = \pi(X^w)$, we have $\pi^{-1}(X_P^w) \supseteq X^w$; we must prove the reverse inclusion. It suffices to show that if $X^y \subset \pi^{-1}(X_P^w)$, then $y \geq w$. The hypothesis $X^y \subset \pi^{-1}(X_P^w)$ implies that yP is in X_P^w. Every T-fixed point in X_P^w is the image of a T-fixed point in X^w, so $yP = zP$ for some $z \geq w$. Since w is minimal, $z_m \geq w$ by Lemma 4.1; since $yW_P = zW_P = z_mW_P$, we have $y \geq z_m$, so $y \geq w$. Hence $\pi^{-1}(X_P^w) = X^w$, as desired. This proves the first assertion. For the second assertion, let w be any element of W. Then $w = w_m x$ for some $x \in W_P$. The element $x \in W_P$ can be represented by an element of $N_L(T)$, which is a subgroup of L. Therefore, $wP = w_mP$, so $X_P^w = \overline{U^- \cdot wP} = \overline{U^- \cdot w_mP} = X_P^{w_m}$. Hence $\pi^{-1}(X_P^w) = \pi^{-1}(X_P^{w_m})$, which equals X^{w_m} by what we have already proved. This proves part (1). For (2), suppose that $w = \pi^{-1}(X_P^y)$. We must show that w is minimal. Since $X_P^y = X_P^{y_m}$, we may assume $y = y_m$. Then by (1), $\pi^{-1}(X_P^y) = X^y$, so $X^y = X^w$. Hence $y = w$, so w is minimal, proving (2). □

Corollary 4.6. *If x and w are minimal (resp. maximal) left W_P-coset representatives, then $X_P^x \subset X_P^w$ if and only if $x \geq w$ (resp. $X_{x,P} \subset X_{w,P}$).*

Proof. Suppose x and w are minimal. If $x \geq w$ then $X^x \subset X^w$ so by Proposition 4.4, $X^x_P \subset X^w_P$. Conversely, if $X^x_P \subset X^w_P$, then by Proposition 4.5, $X^x \subset X^w$ so $x \geq w$. This proves our assertion for minimal elements; the proof for maximal elements is similar. □

Definition 4.7. Write $[\mathcal{O}_{X^w_P}]$ (resp. $[\mathcal{O}_{X_{w,P}}]$) for the classes of the structure sheaves in $K_T(G/P)$, and $[X^w_P]$ (resp. $[X_{w,P}]$) for the fundamental classes in $A^T_*(G/P)$. If $x \in W$, let $i_{x,P}$ denote the inclusion of the T-fixed point xP into $X_P = G/P$. If $P = B$, then we often omit the subscript P from the notation. For X^w_P (resp. $X_{w,P}$) we will often assume that w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_P-coset.

Corollary 4.8. *Suppose w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_P-coset. Then*

$$i^*_{x,P}[\mathcal{O}_{X^w_P}] = i^*_x[\mathcal{O}_{X^w}] \quad \textit{and} \quad i^*_{x,P}[X^w_P] = i^*_x[X^w]$$

(resp.

$$i^*_{x,P}[\mathcal{O}_{X_{w,P}}] = i^*_x[\mathcal{O}_{X_w}] \quad \textit{and} \quad i^*_{x,P}[X_{w,P}] = i^*_x[X_w].)$$

Proof. The proof for K-theory is in [GK15, Section 2.2]. The proof for Chow groups is almost the same. □

Remark 4.9. In what follows, we will state some results in terms of i^*_x applied to classes on G/B. However, if one is interested in Schubert varieties on G/P and prefers to avoid working with the full flag variety, the preceding corollary implies that these formulas can be stated in terms of classes on G/P.

4.3. **Maximal parabolics with respect to Schubert varieties.** Given w in W, we define parabolic subgroups which will be particularly important in the study of Schubert varieties associated to w.

Definition 4.10. Let $w \in W$. Suppose $P = LU_P$ is the standard parabolic subgroup such that the simple roots of Φ^+_L are those simple roots $\alpha \in \Phi^+$ with $w\alpha > 0$ (resp. $w\alpha < 0$). We say P is the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic determined by w.

Remark 4.11. A standard X^w-maximal (or X_w-maximal) parabolic will generally not be a maximal parabolic in the usual sense. Indeed, this is the case in the examples in Section 7.

Proposition 4.12. *Let $w \in W$. Suppose P is the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic determined by w. Then w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its W_P-coset. Moreover, if Q is any standard parabolic subgroup, then w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset if and only if $Q \subset P$.*

Proof. We give the proof in the X^w-maximal case, since the X_w-maximal case is similar. Suppose that Q is a standard parabolic subgroup with Levi factor M containing T. As discussed in Section 4.1, w is minimal in its W_Q-coset if and only if for each simple root

α in Φ_M^+, we have $w\alpha > 0$. By definition, the standard maximal parabolic subgroup $P = LU$ is defined so that the simple roots in Φ_L^+ are exactly the simple roots α with $w\alpha > 0$. Hence w is minimal in its left W_P-coset. Moreover, w is minimal in its left W_Q-coset if and only if the simple roots in Φ_M^+ are a subset of the simple roots of Φ_L^+, which occurs if and only if $Q \subset P$. □

Corollary 4.13. *Let $w \in W$. If P is the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic determined by w, then $X_P = G/P$ is the smallest flag variety such that X^w (resp. X_w) is the inverse image of X_P^w (resp. $X_{w,P}$) under the projection $G/B \to G/P$. More precisely, if X^w (resp. X_w) is the inverse image of X_Q^w (resp. X_w is the inverse image of $X_{w,Q}$) under the map $G/B \to G/Q$, then $Q \subset P$, so $G/B \to G/Q \to G/P$, and the inverse image of X_P^w (resp. $X_{w,P}$) in G/Q is X_Q^w (resp. $X_{w,Q}$).*

Proof. We prove the assertions for X^w; the proof for X_w is similar. If X^w is the inverse image of X_Q^w, Proposition 4.5 implies that w is minimal in its left W_Q-coset, and then Proposition 4.12 implies that $Q \subset P$. Finally, consider the projections

$$G/B \xrightarrow{f} G/Q \xrightarrow{g} G/P.$$

Since $g^{-1}(X_P^w)$ is closed, U^--stable, and irreducible, it is a Schubert variety X_Q^u for some $u \in W$ which is minimal in its left W_Q-coset. By Proposition 4.5, $f^{-1}(X_Q^u) = X^u$; but $f^{-1}(X_Q^u) = f^{-1}(g^{-1}(X_P^w)) = X^w$. Hence $u = w$, so $g^{-1}(X_P^w) = X_Q^w$, as desired. □

5. Slices to Schubert varieties

In this section we construct slices to Schubert varieties at T-fixed points. The slices here are closely related to the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties used in [KL79]. However, we wish the slices we construct to be as small as possible, since the cominuscule condition is more easily satisfied for smaller slices. Moreover, given a projection $\pi : G/B \to G/P$, if $X^w = \pi^{-1}(X_P^w)$ (with w minimal in its left W_P-coset), and $x \geq w$, all the points xB as x runs over a fixed W_P-coset have isomorphic neighborhoods in X^w, but the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties have different dimensions (see equations (5.11) and (5.12)). For these reasons, the slices we define are slightly different: in fact, the slices for X^w are isomorphic to Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties for X_P^w, where P is the standard X^w-maximal parabolic. In fact, if $x \geq w$ and x is also minimal in its left W_P-coset, then by [Knu09, Section 7.3], the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties for X^w at xB and X_P^w at xP are isomorphic, so the slices we use are the same as the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties. See Remarks 5.5 and 5.6 for a more detailed discussion. We have included proofs of some known results for completeness and the convenience of the reader.

5.1. **Preliminary facts.** Suppose H is a linear algebraic group acting on a scheme Z. A subscheme Y of Z is called a slice to Z at z if Y contains z and the action map gives an isomorphism from $H \times Y \to Z^0$, where Z^0 is an open neighborhood of z in Y. If a

torus T acts on H, Y, Z, and Z^0, and the action map is T-equivariant, then the slice is called T-equivariant.

We begin with a lemma about slices. This lemma is known (cf. the proof of [Bri05, Prop. 1.3.5]); for completeness, we give here an explicit statement and proof. This lemma is easy to prove on the level of closed points of schemes. To obtain a scheme-theoretic result, we use the functor of points of a scheme, some facts about which we now recall (see [EH00] and [GW10] for more details.) As always, we work with schemes over $\mathbb{F}$, and all products are fibered over $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{F})$. For any schemes X and A, the set of A-valued points of X is $X(A) = \mathrm{Mor}(A, X)$. If Y is a closed subscheme of X, then $Y(A)$ is a subset of $X(A)$. If H is an algebraic group, then the set $H(A)$ is a group, and if H acts on a scheme Z, then the group $H(A)$ acts on the set $Z(A)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let H be a linear algebraic group, and X a scheme. Let H act on the product $H \times X$ by left multiplication on the first factor. Any H-invariant closed subscheme Z of $H \times X$ is of the form $Z = H \times Y$, where Y is the closed subscheme $(\{e\} \times X) \cap Z$ of $\{e\} \times X$ (which we identify with X).*

Proof. Let $(\alpha, \beta) : Z \to H \times X$ denote the inclusion morphism. By definition, $\{e\} \times Y$ is a closed subscheme of Z. We claim that the closed embedding $H \times Y \to H \times X$ factors as

$$H \times Y \xrightarrow{f} Z \xrightarrow{(\alpha,\beta)} H \times X.$$

Indeed, since $\{e\} \times Y$ is a closed subscheme of Z, and Z is stable under the action of H, the action map $H \times (\{e\} \times Y) \to H \times X$ factors through Z. Since this map is just the map of forgetting the middle factor of $\{e\}$, the claim follows.

By definition, (α, β) is an element of $(H \times X)(Z) = H(Z) \times X(Z)$. In fact, (α, β) is in the subset $Z(Z)$ of $(H \times X)(Z)$. Since Z is invariant under H, the subset $Z(Z)$ is invariant under the group $H(Z)$.

We next claim that (α, β) is in the subset $(H \times Y)(Z)$ of $(H \times X)(Z)$. Equivalently, β is in the subset $Y(Z)$ of $X(Z)$. To see this, let $\alpha' \in H(Z)$ be the inverse of the element α in the group $H(Z)$, and let e_Z be the identity element of $H(Z)$. By $H(Z)$-invariance of $Z(Z)$, $\alpha' \cdot (\alpha, \beta) = (e_Z, \beta)$ is in $Z(Z)$. On the other hand, (e_Z, β) is in $(\{e\} \times X)(Z)$. We conclude that (e_Z, β) is in $(\{e\} \times Y)(Z)$, so β is in $Y(Z)$, as claimed. Note that this claim shows that the closed embedding $(\alpha, \beta) : Z \to H \times X$ factors as

$$Z \xrightarrow{g} H \times Y \xrightarrow{\gamma} H \times X.$$

By the first claim, $(\alpha, \beta) \circ f = \gamma$, and by the second claim, $\gamma \circ g = (\alpha, \beta)$, so the following diagram commutes.



In general, if M_1 and M_2 are closed subschemes of M such that each embedding $i_k : M_k \to M$ factors as

$$M_k \to M_j \stackrel{i_j}{\to} M,$$

then $M_1 = M_2$ as subschemes of M. To see this, we can assume $M = \operatorname{Spec} A$, and then $M_k = \operatorname{Spec} A/I_k$. The factorizations of the embeddings i_k imply that $I_1 \subseteq I_2$ and $I_2 \subseteq I_1$, so $I_1 = I_2$. Applying this observation with $M_1 = H \times Y$, $M_2 = Z$, and $M = H \times X$, proves the lemma. □

The preceding lemma implies that the action map gives an isomorphism $H \times Y \to Z$. We will refer to Y as a slice to Z.

Lemma 5.2. *Let G be a linear algebraic group, T a torus in G, and U a connected unipotent subgroup of G normalized by T. Assume that T has no nonzero weights on $\mathfrak{u}$, and that no two of the weights of T on $\mathfrak{u}$ are multiples of each other. Suppose that $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_n$ are closed subgroups of U, each normalized by T, such that as representations of T,*

$$\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{u}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{u}_2 \oplus \cdots \mathfrak{u}_n.$$

Then the product map

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 \times U_2 \times \cdots \times U_n &\to U \\ (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n) &\to u_1 u_2 \cdots u_n \end{aligned}$$

is an T-equivariant isomorphism of varieties.

Proof. Let α be a weight of T on $\mathfrak{u}$, and $\mathfrak{u}_\alpha$ the corresponding weight subspace of $\mathfrak{u}$. The corresponding root subgroup U_α is a 1-dimensional unipotent subgroup of U which is isomorphic as a T-variety to $\mathfrak{u}_\alpha$ (see [Spr09, Prop. 8.1.1]). By [Spr09, Lemma 8.2.2], if V is any closed subgroup of U normalized by T, and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ are the weights of T on $\mathfrak{v}$, then the product map $\prod_{i=1}^{i} U_{\alpha_i} \to V$ is an isomorphism of varieties.

Let α_{ij} be the weights of T on $\mathfrak{u}_i$, and consider the maps

$$\prod U_{\alpha_{1j}} \times \prod U_{\alpha_{2j}} \times \cdots \times \prod U_{\alpha_{nj}} \longrightarrow U_1 \times U_2 \times \cdots \times U_n \longrightarrow U. \tag{5.1}$$

By the preceding paragraph, the first map and the composition of the two maps are isomorphisms; therefore the second map is an isomorphism as well. □

Remark 5.3. As a T-variety, a root subgroup U_α is isomorphic to its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}_\alpha$. Hence, under the hypotheses of Lemma 5.2, (5.1) yields an isomorphism of U with its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}$ such that each subgroup U_i corresponds to the subspace $\mathfrak{u}_i$.

5.2. **Slices in generalized flag varieties.** In this section, we construct slices to Schubert varieties in generalized flag varieties of the form G/Q. The most important cases for us will be the case where $Q = B$, and the case where Q is X^w-maximal or X_w-maximal for some $w \in W$.

In considering Schubert varieties X^w_Q (resp. $X_{w,Q}$), we may assume without loss of generality that w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset. By Proposition 4.12, this implies that $Q \subset P$, where P is the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic subgroup. If $Q = B$, then W_Q is trivial, so any w is both minimal and maximal. In this case, following our usual convention, we may omit the subscript Q and simply write X^w and X_w. We follow a similar convention for the slices defined below.

Let $Q = MU_Q$ be a standard parabolic subgroup with Levi subgroup M and unipotent radical U_Q. We will frequently make use of the groups U^-_Q and U^-_M defined in Section 4. Note that if $Q = B = TU$ then $U^-_Q = U^-$ and $U^-_M = \{1\}$. Following the notation of Section 4, if H is a subgroup of G normalized by T, and $x \in W$, we write $H(x) = xHx^{-1}$. (As usual, we use the same letter to denote both an element of W and a representative in G.)

The map $U^-_Q(x) \to C_{x,Q} = U^-_Q(x) \cdot xQ$ embeds $U^-_Q(x)$ as an open subvariety of G/Q. Since the point xQ is T-fixed, this embedding is T-equivariant, where T acts by conjugation on $U^-_Q(x)$, and by left multiplication on $C_{x,Q}$. The intersections of $C_{x,Q}$ with Schubert varieties containing xQ give open neighborhoods of xQ in those Schubert varieties. Via the identification of $C_{x,Q}$ with $U^-_Q(x)$ [BL00, 4.4.4], left and right multiplication give left and right actions of any subgroup of $U^-_Q(x)$ on $C_{x,Q}$.

Suppose $Q = MU_Q \subset P = LU_P$ are standard parabolic subgroups, and let $\pi : G/Q \to G/P$ denote the projection. We have $\mathfrak{u}^-_Q = \mathfrak{u}^-_P \oplus (\mathfrak{u}^-_Q \cap \mathfrak{l})$, so by Lemma 5.2, $U^-_Q \cong U^-_P \times (U^-_Q \cap L)$. Conjugating by x, we obtain $U^-_Q(x) = U^-_P(x) \times (U^-_Q \cap L)(x)$.

We have T-equivariant isomorphisms

$$C_{x,Q} \cong U^-_Q(x) \cong U^-_P(x) \times (U^-_Q \cap L)(x) \cong C_{x,P} \times (U^-_Q \cap L)(x). \tag{5.2}$$

Since $L(x)$ (and hence also $(U^-_Q \cap L)(x)$) fixes the point xP, using (5.2), we see that the projection π takes $C_{x,Q}$ to $C_{x,P}$. Let $\rho := \pi|_{C_{x,Q}}$. If Z is any subscheme of $C_{x,P}$, then under the identification given by (5.2),

$$\rho^{-1}(Z) = Z \times (U^-_Q \cap L)(x). \tag{5.3}$$

In particular, if w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_P-coset, then since $\rho^{-1}(X^w_P \cap C_{x,P}) = X^w_Q \cap C_{x,Q}$ (resp. $\rho^{-1}(X_{w,P} \cap C_{x,P}) = X_{w,Q} \cap C_{x,Q}$)), we see that under the

identification given by (5.2),

$$X_Q^w \cap C_{x,Q} = (X_P^w \cap C_{x,P}) \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x) \tag{5.4}$$

$$X_{w,Q} \cap C_{x,Q} = (X_{w,P} \cap C_{x,P}) \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x). \tag{5.5}$$

Definition 5.4. Let Q be a standard parabolic subgroup, and let $w, x \in W$.

(1) Suppose w is minimal in its left W_Q-coset, and suppose $x \geq w$. Let P be the X^w-maximal parabolic determined by w, so $P \supset Q$ and $U_P^- \subset U_Q^-$. Define

$$\mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w = [(U_P^-(x) \cap U) \cdot xQ] \cap X_Q^w.$$

(2) Suppose w is maximal in its left W_Q-coset, and suppose $x \leq w$. Let P be the X_w-maximal parabolic determined by w, so $P \supset Q$ and $U_P^- \subset U_Q^-$. Define

$$\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q = [(U_P^-(x) \cap U^-) \cdot xQ] \cap X_{w,Q}.$$

If $Q = B$ we may omit the subscript or superscript Q and write simply $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ or $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}$.

We show in Proposition 5.10 that the varieties defined in Definition 5.4 are slices to Schubert varieties.

Remark 5.5. The slices to Schubert varieties in G/B defined by Kazhdan and Lusztig (see [KL79, Lemma A.4], cf. [LY12, Section 2.1]) are the intersection of a Schubert variety with the big cell of an opposite Schubert variety. In our notation, this amounts to (in the case of X^w; similar remarks would apply for X_w) the intersection $X^w \cap X_x^0 = X^w \cap (U^-(x) \cap U) \cdot xB$. Let P be the standard X^w-maximal parabolic. If x is minimal in its left W_P-coset, then by Lemma 4.3, $U^-(x) \cap U = U_P^-(x) \cap U$, so the Kazhdan-Lusztig variety $X^w \cap X_x^0$ coincides with $\mathcal{N}_x^w$. In general, while we have a containment $X^w \cap X_x^0 \supset \mathcal{N}_x^w$, if x is not minimal in its left W_P-coset, this is not an equality. Indeed, by Remark 5.14 and Proposition 5.13, $\dim X^w \cap X_x^0 = \ell(x) - \ell(w)$ and $\dim \mathcal{N}_x^w = \ell(x) - |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^+| - \ell(w)$, and $|x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^+| = 0$ if and only if x is minimal.

Remark 5.6. The term Kazhdan-Lusztig variety is used in [Knu09, Section 7.3] in the context of generalized flag varieties, that is, in the case where the Schubert variety and opposite Schubert variety are in G/Q for some parabolic subgroup Q. Suppose $x \geq w$ are elements of W. Knutson observes that if $x \geq w$ are elements of W which are both minimal in their left W_Q-cosets, then the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties $X^w \cap X_x^0$ and $X_Q^w \cap X_{x,Q}^0$ are isomorphic. Suppose P is the standard X^w-maximal parabolic subgroup. By definition, the slice $\mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w$ is a Kazhdan-Lusztig variety in X_P. If x is minimal in its left W_P-coset, then by Remark 5.5, $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ is a Kazhdan-Lusztig variety, so Knutson's observation implies that $\mathcal{N}_x^w \cong \mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w$. If x is not minimal in its left W_P-coset, then $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ is not a Kazhdan-Lusztig variety in X, but $\mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w$ is a Kazhdan-Lusztig variety in X_P (since $\mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w$ depends only on the left W_P-coset of x), and Proposition 5.11 implies that the isomorphism $\mathcal{N}_x^w \cong \mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w$ still holds. This is one motivation for using $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ instead of the Kazhdan-Lusztig variety $X^w \cap X_x^0$.

Remark 5.7. The definition of the slice only depends on the point xQ and not on the particular element $x \in W$. The reason is that if $xQ = yQ$, then $xW_Q = yW_Q$. Since $Q \subset P$ (for P as in Definition 5.4), we have $xW_P = yW_P$. By Lemma 4.2, $U_P^-(x) = U_P^-(y)$, which implies our assertion.

Remark 5.8. We will see in Proposition 5.11 below that the slice $\mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q$) only depends on w and x, and not on the particular parabolic Q, provided of course that w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset. The reason is that if P is the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic, then $\mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^P$). For this reason, in subsequent sections, we will often focus on the case where the parabolic is B (that is, the case where the slices are in G/B); these slices we denote simply by $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ or $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}$. However, we may write $\mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w$ or $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q$ if we wish to remind the reader that the ambient flag variety is G/Q. Note that by the previous remark and Corollary 5.12, if P is the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic, then $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}$) only depends on the left W_P-coset of x.

Remark 5.9. For later use, note that the definition of $\mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w$ we could intersect with $X_Q^w \cap C_{x,Q}$ instead of just X_Q^w, since $(U_P^-(x) \cap U) \cdot xQ$ is contained in $C_{x,Q}$. A similar remark applies to $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q$.

By Proposition 5.10 below, $\mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w$ and $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q$ are slices of the Schubert varieties X_Q^w and X_w^Q (respectively) at xQ. The slices are T-stable subschemes of G/Q, since each is the intersection of two T-stable subvarieties of G/Q.

Suppose H_1 and H_2 are subgroups of $U_Q^-(x)$. We will call the left action of $H_1 \times H_2$ on $C_{x,Q} = U_Q^-(x) \cdot xQ$ defined by the formula

$$(h_1, h_2) \cdot uxQ = (h_1 u h_2^{-1})xQ.$$

the two-side action. If H_1 and H_2 are stable under conjugation by T, then T acts on the product $(H_1 \times H_2) \times C_x$ (since it acts on each factor), and then the action map

$$(H_1 \times H_2) \times C_{x,Q} \to C_{x,Q}$$

is T-equivariant.

By [Bri05, Prop. 1.3.5], the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties are slices to Schubert varieties. Precisely, Brion shows that if $x \leq w$, there is an isomorphism

$$(U^-(x) \cap U) \times (X_w \cap X_0^x) \to X^w \cap C_x. \tag{5.6}$$

By a similar argument, one can show that if $x \geq w$, then there is an isomorphism

$$(U^-(x) \cap U^-) \times (X^w \cap X_x^0) \to X^w \cap C_x. \tag{5.7}$$

The next proposition is analogous to [Bri05, Prop. 1.3.5], and has a similar proof. It shows that the varieties defined in Definition 5.4 are also slices to Schubert varieties.

Proposition 5.10. *Let $w \in W$.*

(1) *Suppose w is minimal in its left W_Q-coset. Let $P = LU_P$ be the X^w-maximal parabolic subgroup determined by w. Suppose $x \geq w$. The action map gives a T-equivariant isomorphism*

$$[(U_P^-(x) \cap U^-) \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x)] \times \mathcal{N}_x^w \to X_Q^w \cap C_{x,Q}, \tag{5.8}$$

where the action is the two-side action.

(2) *Suppose w is minimal in its left W_Q-coset. Let $P = LU_P$ be the X_w-maximal parabolic subgroup determined by w. Suppose $x \leq w$. The action map gives a T-equivariant isomorphism*

$$[(U_P^-(x) \cap U) \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x)] \times \mathcal{N}_{w,x} \to X_{w,Q} \cap C_x, \tag{5.9}$$

where the action is the two-side action.

Proof. We only give the proof of (1), since the proof of (2) is similar. By the remarks preceding the proposition, the map (5.8) is T-equivariant. We must prove that this map is an isomorphism. We can decompose $\mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) = (\mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u}^-) \oplus (\mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u})$, and hence $U_P^-(x) \cong (U_P^-(x) \cap U^-) \times (U_P^-(x) \cap U)$. Combining this with (5.2), we obtain an isomorphism

$$(U_P^-(x) \cap U^-) \times (U_P^-(x) \cap U) \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x) \to U_Q^-(x) \cong C_{x,Q}. \tag{5.10}$$

Since $C_{x,Q}$ is stable under the left action of $U_P^-(x)$ (as $U_P^-(x) \subset U_Q^-(x)$), and X_Q^w is stable under the left action of U^-, $X_Q^w \cap C_{x,Q}$ is stable under the left action of $U_P^-(x) \cap U^-$. Also, (5.4) implies that $X_Q^w \cap C_{x,Q}$ is stable under the right action of $(U_Q^- \cap L)(x)$. We conclude that $X_Q^w \cap C_{x,Q}$ is stable under the two-side action of $H = (U_P^-(x) \cap U^-) \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x)$ on $C_{x,Q}$.

Applying Lemma 5.1 with H as above, $Z = X_Q^w \cap C_{x,Q}$, and $Y = (U_P^-(x) \cap U) \cdot xQ$, we see that under the identification (5.10), the embedding $X_Q^w \cap C_{x,Q} \subset C_{x,Q}$ corresponds to the embedding

$$(U_P^-(x) \cap U^-) \times \mathcal{N}_x^w \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x) \subset (U_P^-(x) \cap U^-) \times (U_P^-(x) \cap U) \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x).$$

This proves (1). □

Proposition 5.11. *Suppose w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset. Let $P = LU_P$ be the X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic subgroup determined by w. Suppose $x \geq w$ (resp. $x \leq w$). Under the identification of $C_{x,Q}$ with $C_{x,P} \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x)$ from* (5.2)*, we have*

$$\mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w = \mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w \times \{1\}$$

(resp.

$$\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q = \mathcal{N}_{w,x}^P \times \{1\}.)$$

Proof. We prove the assertions in the case where w is minimal; the case where w is maximal is similar. As noted above, under the identification (5.2) of $C_{x,Q}$ with $C_{x,P} \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x)$, we have

$$X_Q^w \cap C_{x,Q} = (X_P^w \cap C_{x,P}) \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x)$$

(see (5.4)). Also, under the identification (5.2), we have

$$(U_P^-(x) \cap U) \cdot xQ = ((U_P^-(x) \cap U) \cdot xP) \times \{1\}.$$

Therefore, under the identification (5.2), the slice

$$\mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w := [(U_P^-(x) \cap U) \cdot xQ] \cap X_Q^w$$

corresponds to

$$[((U_P^-(x) \cap U) \cdot xP) \times \{1\}] \cap [(X_P^w \cap C_{x,P}) \times (U_Q^- \cap L)(x)] = \mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w \times \{1\}.$$

This proves the result. □

As noted in Remark 5.8, the preceding proposition implies that up to isomorphism, the slices $\mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q$) are independent of the parabolic Q, provided that w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset. Hence, as in the next corollary, we will frequently only consider the slices $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ and $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}$ in G/B.

Corollary 5.12. *Let $w \in W$ and let P be the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic subgroup. Suppose $x \geq w$, $y \geq w$ (resp. $x \leq w$, $y \leq w$). If x and y are in the same left W_P-coset, then $\mathcal{N}_x^w \cong \mathcal{N}_y^w$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{w,x} \cong \mathcal{N}_{w,y}$).*

Proof. We prove the corollary in the case of X^w; the case of X_w is similar. Since $xW_P = yW_P$, we have $xP = yP$ in G/P. Thus, $\mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w$ and $\mathcal{N}_{y,P}^w$ are actually equal (not merely isomorphic). By Proposition 5.11, $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ and $\mathcal{N}_y^w$ are each isomorphic to $\mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w = \mathcal{N}_{y,P}^w$. The result follows. □

The next proposition gives the dimensions of the slices $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ and $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}$. Observe that if x is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_P-coset, then $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}$) is a Kazhdan-Lusztig variety, by Remark 5.5. In this case, $|x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^+| = 0$ (resp. $|x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^-| = 0$), and the formulas of Proposition 5.13 coincide with the formulas in Remark 5.14 for the dimensions of the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties.

Proposition 5.13. (1) *Suppose $x \geq w$. Let P be the standard X^w-maximal parabolic. Then*

$$\dim \mathcal{N}_x^w = \ell(x) - |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^+| - \ell(w).$$

If $yW_P = xW_P$, then $\dim \mathcal{N}_x^w = \dim \mathcal{N}_y^w$.

(2) *Suppose $x \leq w$. Let P be the standard X_w-maximal parabolic. Then*

$$\dim \mathcal{N}_{w,x} = \ell(w) - |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^-| - \ell(x).$$

If $yW_P = xW_P$, then $\dim \mathcal{N}_{w,x} = \dim \mathcal{N}_{w,y}$.

Proof. We prove (1). The proof of (2) is similar; we omit the details. Let $N = \dim G/B$. By (5.8), with $Q = B$, we have

$$(U_P^-(x) \cap U^-) \times U_L^-(x) \times \mathcal{N}_x^w \cong X^w \cap C_x.$$

By Lemma 5.2, $U_L^-(x) \cong (U_L^-(x) \cap U^-) \times (U_L^-(x) \cap U^+)$ and $(U_P^-(x) \cap U^-) \times (U_L^-(x) \cap U^-) \cong U^-(x) \cap U^-$. Thus

$$(U^-(x) \cap U^-) \times (U_L^-(x) \cap U^+) \times \mathcal{N}_x^w \cong X^w \cap C_x.$$

Taking dimensions, we obtain

$$(N - \ell(x)) + |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^+| + \dim \mathcal{N}_x^w = N - \ell(w),$$

from which the first assertion of (1) follows. The second assertion holds because by Corollary 5.12, if $xW_P = yW_P$, then $\mathcal{N}_x^w \cong \mathcal{N}_y^w$. □

Remark 5.14. The dimensions of the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties are known; indeed, they easily follow from the fact that they are slices. If $x \geq w$, then equation (5.7) implies

$$\dim(X^w \cap X_x^0) = \ell(x) - \ell(w), \tag{5.11}$$

since (with $N = \dim G/B$), $\dim(U^-(x) \cap U^-) = N - \ell(x)$ and $\dim X^w = N - \ell(w)$. Similarly, if $x \leq w$, then equation (5.6) implies that

$$\dim(X_w \cap X_0^x) = \ell(w) - \ell(x), \tag{5.12}$$

since $\dim(U^-(x) \cap U) = |x\Phi^- \cap \Phi^+| = \ell(x)$, and $\dim X_w = \ell(x)$. Suppose that $x \geq w$ and P is the standard X^w-maximal parabolic. Even if $xW_P = yW_P$, the dimensions of the Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties $X^w \cap X_x^0$ and $X^w \cap X_y^0$ need not be equal. In contrast, the slices $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ and $\mathcal{N}_y^w$ are isomorphic. The situation is similar for the opposite Kazhdan-Lusztig varieties and slices.

The results of this section make it straightforward to describe the sets of weights $\Phi(T_{xB}(\mathcal{N}_x^w))$ and $\Phi(T_{xB}(\mathcal{N}_{w,x}))$ in terms of the corresponding sets $\Phi(T_{xB}(X^w))$ and $\Phi(T_{xB}(X_w))$. We give these descriptions in Proposition 6.16, after we have introduced some more notation. These descriptions are useful because they give us a way to determine if a point is cominuscule, at least in the case of classical groups, where the sets $\Phi(T_{xB}(X^w))$ and $\Phi(T_{xB}(X_w))$ were described by Lakshmibai and Seshadri [LS84] for type A and by Lakshmibai [Lak95] [Lak00a] [Lak00b] for all classical types (see also [BL00, Chapter 5]).

6. Cominuscule points of Schubert varieties

6.1. **Cominuscule points.** The definition of generalized cominuscule points allows for arbitrary slices $\mathcal{N}$. For Schubert varieties, it is convenient to introduce a definition which refers to the particular slices $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ and $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}$. Since by Proposition 5.11, $\mathcal{N}_x^w \cong \mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{w,x} \cong \mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q$) for any standard parabolic subgroup Q such that w is minimal

(resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset, this definition applies to slices in any generalized flag variety.

Definition 6.1. Suppose w and x are elements of w and $x \geq w$ (resp. $x \leq w$). We will say that x is cominuscule in X^w (resp. x is cominuscule in X_w) if there exists a rational $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that for all α in $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w)$ (resp. $\alpha \in \Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_{w,x})$), we have $\alpha(v) = -1$. In this case, for any standard parabolic subgroup Q such that w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset, we say that xQ is a cominuscule point of X_Q^w (resp. $X_{w,Q}$).

Remark 6.2. Suppose w and x are elements of w and $x \geq w$ (resp. $x \leq w$). The following conditions are equivalent:

(1) x is cominuscule in X^w (resp. in X_w)

(2) For all standard parabolic subgroups Q such that w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset, xQ is a cominuscule point of X_Q^w (resp. $X_{w,Q}$).

(3) For some standard parabolic subgroup Q such that w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset, xQ is a cominuscule point of X_Q^w (resp. $X_{w,Q}$).

The conditions are equivalent because the slices $\mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q$) are independent of the parabolic Q, provided that w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset.

Remark 6.3. As in Remark 3.5, the condition that v be rational is not a genuine restriction. If the condition $\alpha(v) = -1$ is satisfied for all weights α on the tangent space to the normal slice, by Lemma 2.4, we can (if necessary) replace v by a rational element v' satisfying the condition $\alpha(v')$ for all weights α on the tangent space to the normal slice.

As an immediate consequence of Corollary 5.12, we have the following.

Corollary 6.4. *Let $w \in W$ and let P be the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic subgroup. Suppose that $x \geq w$ (resp. $x \leq w$). Then x is cominuscule in X^w (resp. x is cominuscule in X_w) if and only if for all $y \in xW_P$, y is cominuscule in X^w (resp. y is cominuscule in X_w).* □

Example 6.5. We give some examples of cominuscule and non-cominuscule points.

(1) If $w = 1$, then $X^w = X$, and the standard X^w-maximal parabolic is $P = G$. In this case, $U_P^- = \{1\}$. Thus for any $x \in W$, $\mathcal{N}_x^1$ is a point, so xB is a cominuscule point in X^1.

(2) If $Y \subset X = G/B$ is the inverse image of a Schubert variety in a cominuscule flag variety, then any T-fixed point in Y is a cominuscule point of Y. (See Proposition 6.8.)

(3) If x is a cominuscule element of W, then xB is a cominuscule point in any X^w containing it. In type A_{n-1}, the Weyl group is the symmetric group S_n, and the cominuscule elements are the 321-avoiding permutations. (See Section 6.6.)

(4) The point wB is cominuscule in X^w. (See Proposition 6.7.)

(5) See Section 7 for some examples not of the above types. The Schubert variety considered in Sections 7.2 and 7.3 provides an example of a Schubert variety which contains both cominuscule and non-cominuscule T-fixed points.

By the next proposition, the definition of cominuscule points is compatible with our earlier definition of generalized cominuscule points.

Proposition 6.6. *Suppose w and x are elements of W and $x \geq w$ (resp. $x \leq w$). Let Q be a standard parabolic subgroup of G, and suppose that w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_Q-coset. If xQ is a cominuscule point of X_Q^w (resp. of $X_{w,Q}$), then xQ is a generalized cominuscule point of X_Q^w (resp. $X_{w,Q}$).*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{N}_x^w \cong \mathcal{N}_{x,Q}^w$ and $\mathcal{N}_{w,x} \cong \mathcal{N}_{w,x}^Q$, this follows immediately from Proposition 5.10 and the definitions of generalized cominuscule point and cominuscule point. □

The next proposition shows that every Schubert variety has at least one cominuscule point.

Proposition 6.7. *The element w is cominuscule in X^w (resp. X_w).*

Proof. The cell C_w is $U^-(w) \cap wB$. By Lemma 5.2, we have

$$U^- = (U^-(w) \cap U^-) \times (U(w) \cap U^-).$$

The second factor is the stabilizer in U^- of wB, so the open cell in X^w is

$$X_0^w = U^- \cdot wB = (U^-(w) \cap U^-) \cdot wB.$$

Since this is a closed subset of C_w, it equals $X^w \cap C_w$. The slice at wB is

$$\mathcal{N}_w^w = (X^w \cap C_w) \cap [(U_P^-(w) \cap U) \cdot wB],$$

where P is the standard X^w-maximal parabolic. The groups $U_P^-(w) \cap U$ and $U^-(w) \cap U^-$ are subgroups of $U^-(w)$ whose intersection is $\{1\}$, so

$$\mathcal{N}_w^w = [(U_P^-(w) \cap U) \cdot wB] \ \cap \ [(U^-(w) \cap U^-) \cdot wB] = \{wB\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{N}_w^w$ is a single point, the cominuscule condition is satisfied, and hence w is cominuscule in X^w. This proves the proposition for X^w. The proof for X_w proceeds similarly by showing that $\mathcal{N}_{w,w} = \{wB\}$; we omit the details. □

We now show that Schubert varieties in cominuscule flag varieties give rise to points which are cominuscule in our sense. We begin by recalling the definition of cominuscule flag varieties. Suppose that $P = LU$ is a maximal standard parabolic subgroup; then there is a unique simple root β which is not in Φ_L. The parabolic subgroup P and the corresponding flag variety G/P are said to be of cominuscule type if the simple root β appears with coefficient equal to 1 when the highest root is written as a sum of simple roots. In this case, it is known that for any $x \in W$ there exists an element $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that for any $\alpha \in \Phi(T_{xP}(G/P))$, $\alpha(v) = -1$ (one reference is [GK15, Prop. 2.9]).

Proposition 6.8. *Suppose P is a standard parabolic subgroup of cominuscule type, and x is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_P-coset. Then for any $w \leq x$ (resp. $w \geq x$), x is cominuscule in X^w (resp. X_w).*

Proof. The tangent space $T_{xP}(\mathcal{N}_{x,P}^w)$ (resp. $T_{xP}(\mathcal{N}_{w,x}^P)$) is a subspace of $T_{xP}(G/P)$, so the cominuscule condition on the tangent space of the normal slice holds because it holds for $T_{xP}(G/P)$. □

6.2. **Hilbert series and multiplicity formulas at cominuscule points.** The main result of this section is Theorem 6.14, which gives formulas for the Hilbert series and multiplicity at cominuscule points of Schubert varieties. This result is a straightforward consequence of the corresponding result for generalized cominuscule points, Theorem 3.10. As observed in Remark 4.9, the pullbacks of Schubert classes on generalized flag varieties can be computed using the corresponding pullbacks on the full flag variety. Similarly, the following result shows that to give formulas for Hilbert series and multiplicity on generalized flag varieties, it suffices to consider the case of the full flag variety.

Proposition 6.9. *Let P be a standard parabolic subgroup, and suppose w is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_P-coset. Suppose $x \geq w$ (resp. $x \leq w$). Let $d = \dim G/B - \dim G/P = |\Phi_L^+|$. Then*

$$H(X_P^w, xP) = (1-t)^d H(X^w, xB) \quad \textit{and} \quad \operatorname{mult}(X_P^w, xP) = \operatorname{mult}(X^w, xB)$$

(resp.

$$H(X_{w,P}, xP) = (1-t)^d H(X_w, xB) \quad \textit{and} \quad \operatorname{mult}(X_{w,P}, xP) = \operatorname{mult}(X_w, xB)).$$

Proof. We give the proof if w is minimal; the case where w is maximal is similar. In this case, (5.4) yields

$$X^w \cap C_x \cong (X_P^w \cap C_{x,P}) \times U_L^-(x).$$

The group $U_L^-(x)$ is isomorphic to affine space of dimension d, so $H(U_L^-(x), e) = \frac{1}{(1-t)^d}$, and $\mathrm{mult}(U_L^-(x), e) = 1$. The result now follows immediately from Proposition 2.3. □

To simplify the notation, we will write simply $H(X^w, x)$ for $H(X^w, xB)$ and $\mathrm{mult}(X^w, x)$ for $\mathrm{mult}(X^w, xB)$, with similar notation for X_w.

Before stating the Hilbert series and multiplicity formulas, we recall some background. Given $y \in W$, the inversion set $I(y)$ is by definition

$$I(y) = \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \mid y\alpha \in \Phi^-\} = \Phi^+ \cap y^{-1}\Phi^-. \tag{6.1}$$

For later use, note that we can also define a corresponding inversion set of coroots:

$$I^\vee(y) = \{\alpha^\vee \in (\Phi^\vee)^+ \mid y\alpha^\vee \in (\Phi^\vee)^-\} = \{\alpha^\vee \in (\Phi^\vee)^+ \mid \alpha \in I(y)\}. \tag{6.2}$$

The set of weights of the tangent space to a slice is contained in the set $\Phi(T_{xB}X) = x\Phi^-$ of weights of $T_{xB}X$. The statement of Theorem 6.14 uses the following two subsets of $x\Phi^-$.

Definition 6.10. Define

$$\mathrm{Down}_x = \{\alpha \in x\Phi^- \mid s_\alpha x < x\}, \quad \mathrm{Up}_x = \{\alpha \in x\Phi^- \mid s_\alpha x > x\}. \tag{6.3}$$

More generally, if $P = LU_P$ is a standard parabolic subgroup, define

$$\mathrm{Down}_{x,P} = \{\alpha \in x\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) \mid s_\alpha x < x\}, \quad \mathrm{Down}_{x,L} = \{\alpha \in x\Phi_L^- \mid s_\alpha x < x\}, \tag{6.4}$$

so $\mathrm{Down}_x = \mathrm{Down}_{x,P} \cup \mathrm{Down}_{x,L}$. Similarly, define

$$\mathrm{Up}_x^P = \{\alpha \in x\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) \mid s_\alpha x > x\}, \quad \mathrm{Up}_x^L = \{\alpha \in x\Phi_L^- \mid s_\alpha x > x\}, \tag{6.5}$$

so $\mathrm{Up}_x = \mathrm{Up}_x^P \cup \mathrm{Up}_x^L$.

Remark 6.11. The sets Down_x and Up_x, as well as the sets Down_x^w and $\mathrm{Up}_{w,x}$ from Definition 6.17 below, are closely related to the sets defined in [BG03, Def. 4.1]. For example, [BG03] defined U_x as the set of $\alpha \in \Phi^+$ such that $x < xs_\alpha$. Since $xs_\alpha = s_{x\alpha}x$, we see that $\alpha \in U_x$ if and only if $-x\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x$, so $\mathrm{Up}_x = -xU_x$. Similarly, $\mathrm{Up}_{w,x} = -xM_x^w$.

The next proposition gives an alternative description of the sets from Definition 6.10.

Proposition 6.12. *We have*

$$\mathrm{Down}_x = \Phi^+ \cap x\Phi^- = I(x^{-1}), \quad \mathrm{Up}_x = \Phi^- \cap x\Phi^- = w_0 I((w_0 x)^{-1}). \tag{6.6}$$

Hence

$$\mathrm{Down}_{x,P} = \Phi^+ \cap x\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-), \quad \mathrm{Down}_{x,L} = \Phi^+ \cap x\Phi_L^-$$

and

$$\mathrm{Up}_x^P = \Phi^- \cap x\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-), \quad \mathrm{Up}_x^L = \Phi^- \cap x\Phi_L^-.$$

Proof. If $\alpha \in \Phi^+$, then $xs_\alpha > x$ if $x\alpha > 0$, and $xs_\alpha < x$ if $x\alpha < 0$ (see Section 4.1). Thus, for any root α, we have $xs_\alpha > x$ if and only if $x\alpha$ has the same sign (i.e., positive or negative) as α. This implies that $s_\alpha x > x$ if and only if $x^{-1}\alpha$ has the same sign as α (since $s_\alpha x > x$ iff $x^{-1}s_\alpha > x^{-1}$).

Suppose now that $\alpha \in x\Phi^-$; this is equivalent to the statement $x^{-1}\alpha < 0$. The preceding paragraph implies that $s_\alpha x > x$ iff $\alpha < 0$, and $s_\alpha x < x$ iff $\alpha > 0$. Hence $\mathrm{Down}_x = \Phi^+ \cap x\Phi^-$, and by definition of inversion sets, this is equal to $I(x^{-1})$. Similarly, $\mathrm{Up}_x = \Phi^- \cap x\Phi^-$. We can rewrite the right-hand side as

$$w_0 w_0(\Phi^- \cap x\Phi^-) = w_0(\Phi^+ \cap w_0 x\Phi^-) = w_0 I((w_0 x)^{-1}).$$

This proves (6.6). The formulas for $\mathrm{Down}_{x,P}$ and Up_x^P follow from this equation and the definitions, since $\Phi^- = \Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) \cup \Phi_L^-$. □

Corollary 6.13. *The element $x \in W$ is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_P-coset if and only if* $\mathrm{Down}_x = \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}$ *and* $\mathrm{Down}_{x,L}$ *is empty (resp.* $\mathrm{Up}_x = \mathrm{Up}_x^P$ *and* Up_x^L *is empty).*

Proof. Observe that $\Phi^- = \Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) \cup \Phi_L^-$. By Proposition 6.12, $\mathrm{Down}_x = \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}$ and $\mathrm{Down}_{x,L}$ is empty if and only if $x\Phi_L^- \subset \Phi^-$ (resp. $\mathrm{Up}_x = \mathrm{Up}_x^P$ if and only if $x\Phi_L^- \subset \Phi^+$). By the discussion in Section 4.1, this happens if and only if x is minimal (resp. maximal) in its left W_P-coset. □

Theorem 6.14. *Let $N = \dim G/B = |\Phi^+|$. Let $w \in W$.*

(1) *Suppose x is cominuscule in X^w. Let v be as in Definition 6.1. Let $P = LU$ be the standard X^w-maximal parabolic subgroup, and let $d' = N - \ell(x) + |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^+|$. Then*

$$H(X^w, x) = \frac{1}{(1-t)^{d'}} \mathrm{ev}_v \Big(\frac{i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_{X^w}]}{\prod_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}} (1 - e^{-\alpha})} \Big) \tag{6.7}$$

$$\mathrm{mult}(X^w, x) = \mathrm{ev}_{-v} \Big(\frac{i_x^*[X^w]}{\prod_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}} \alpha} \Big). \tag{6.8}$$

Note that if x is minimal in its left W_P-coset, then $d' = N - \ell(x)$ and $\mathrm{Down}_{x,P} = \mathrm{Down}_x$.

(2) *Suppose x is cominuscule in X_w. Let v be as in Definition 6.1. Let $P = LU$ be the standard X_w-maximal parabolic subgroup, and let $d' = \ell(x) + |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^-|$. Then*

$$H(X_w, x) = \frac{1}{(1-t)^{d'}} \mathrm{ev}_v \Big(\frac{i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_{X_w}]}{\prod_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x^P} (1 - e^{-\alpha})} \Big) \tag{6.9}$$

$$\mathrm{mult}(X_w, x) = \mathrm{ev}_{-v} \Big(\frac{i_x^*[X_w]}{\prod_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x^P} \alpha} \Big). \tag{6.10}$$

Note that if x is maximal in its left W_P-coset, then $d' = \ell(x)$ and $\mathrm{Up}_x^P = \mathrm{Up}_x$.

Proof. (1) We apply Theorem 3.10, with $V' = (\mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u}^-) \oplus \mathfrak{u}_L^-(x)$, $V = \mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u}$, and $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_x^w$. It suffices to determine what each piece of the formulas of Theorem 3.10 corresponds to in our setting. We have

$$\Phi(V) = \Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u}) = \Phi^+ \cap x\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) = \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}\,.$$

Thus,

$$\lambda_{-1}(V^*) = \prod_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}} (1 - e^{-\alpha}), \quad c_d^T(V) = \prod_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}} \alpha.$$

Also, $d = \dim V = \ell(x) - |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^+|$ and $d' = N - d = N - \ell(x) + |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^+|$. The Hilbert series and multiplicity formulas now follow from Theorem 3.10 by making the appropriate substitutions. The final observation, concerning the case where x is minimal, follows from Corollary 6.13 and its proof.

(2) The proof is similar to the proof of part (1), with $V' = (\mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u}) \oplus \mathfrak{u}_L^-(x)$, $V = \mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u}^-$, and $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_{w,x}$. In this case $d' = \dim V' = \ell(x) + |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^-|$. The remainder of the argument is omitted, since it is almost the same as the argument for part (1). □

Remark 6.15. As noted in Remark 3.11, it may be necessary to cancel terms from the numerator and denominator of (3.4) and (3.5) before performing the evaluations. We show in [GK17] that in the setting of Schubert varieties, the necessary cancellations can be explicitly described, so that the evaluation can be performed. In fact, it is shown in [GK17] that the formulas can be evaluated without having to find v.

6.3. **Tangent spaces to slices.** The cominuscule condition is a condition on the sets of weights $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w)$ (for $x \geq w$) and $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_{w,x})$ (for $x \leq w$). The next proposition, which is a straightforward consequence of Proposition 5.10, describes these sets in terms of $\Phi(T_{xB}X^w)$ and $\Phi(T_{xB}X_w)$. These last two sets have been combinatorially described by Lakshmibai and Seshadri [LS84] for type A and by Lakshmibai [Lak95] [Lak00a] [Lak00b] for all classical types (see also [BL00, Chapter 5]). This gives a way to determine whether a T-fixed point is cominuscule in a classical Schubert variety. We give some applications in this paper; further combinatorial refinements appear in [GK17].

Proposition 6.16. *Let $w \in W$, and let P be the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic. If $x \geq w$ (resp. $x \leq w$) then*

$$\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w) = \Phi(T_{xB}X^w) \setminus (\mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_{x,L}) \subseteq \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}\,. \tag{6.11}$$

(resp.

$$\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_{x,w}) = \Phi(T_{xB}X_w) \setminus (\mathrm{Down}_x \cup \mathrm{Up}_x^L) \subseteq \mathrm{Up}_x^P\,.) \tag{6.12}$$

Proof. Proposition 5.10 implies that as representations of T,

$$T_{xB}X^w = (\mathfrak{u}_P^-(x) \cap \mathfrak{u}^-) \oplus \mathfrak{u}_L^-(x) \oplus T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w.$$

Therefore, using Proposition 6.12, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(T_{xB}X^w) &= (x\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-)\cap\Phi^-) \cup x\Phi_L^- \cup \Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w)\\ &= (x\Phi^-\cap\Phi^-) \cup (x\Phi_L^-\cap\Phi^+) \cup \Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w)\\ &= \mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_{x,L} \cup \Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w).\end{aligned}$$

This implies the equality in (6.11). To show the inclusion in (6.11), observe that

$$T_{xB}X^w \subset T_{xB}X = x\Phi^- = \mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_x = \mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_{x,L} \cup \mathrm{Down}_{x,P},$$

so

$$\Phi(T_x\mathcal{N}_x^w) = \Phi(T_xX^w) \setminus (\mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_{x,L}) \subseteq \mathrm{Down}_{x,P},$$

as desired. The proof of (6.12) is similar, and we omit it. □

6.4. **Cominuscule points and tangent lines to invariant curves.** The Zariski tangent spaces to Schubert varieties, and hence the sets $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w)$ and $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_{w,x})$, can be complicated to describe in types other than type A. However, we can easily identify certain subsets of these sets, which in type A are the entire sets. This simplifies the criterion for a point to be cominuscule in type A (see Corollary 6.21).

Definition 6.17. Let P be a parabolic subgroup. If $x \geq w$, set

$$\mathrm{Down}_{x,P}^w = \{\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_{x,P} \mid s_\alpha x \geq w\}, \quad \mathrm{Down}_{x,L}^w = \{\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_{x,L} \mid s_\alpha x \geq w\},$$

and set $\mathrm{Down}_x^w = \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}^w \cup \mathrm{Down}_{x,L}^w$. If $x \leq w$, set

$$\mathrm{Up}_{w,x}^P = \{\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x^P \mid s_\alpha x \leq w\}, \quad \mathrm{Up}_{w,x}^L = \{\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x^L \mid s_\alpha x \leq w\},$$

and set $\mathrm{Up}_{w,x} = \mathrm{Up}_{w,x}^P \cup \mathrm{Up}_{w,x}^L$.

Remark 6.18. Suppose w is minimal in its left W_P-coset. Then $\mathrm{Down}_{x,L}^w = \mathrm{Down}_{x,L}$ by Lemma 4.1. Similarly, if w is maximal in its left W_P-coset, then $\mathrm{Up}_{x,L}^w = \mathrm{Up}_{x,L}$. These observations appear implicitly in the proof of Corollary 6.21 below.

The next proposition, which essentially restates some results of Carrell and Peterson and of Lakshmibai and Seshadri, explains the geometric importance of these sets. Suppose Y is a closed T-invariant subvariety $Y \subset X$ containing xB. Let $TE_{xB}Y$ denote the subspace of the Zariski tangent space $T_{xB}Y$ spanned by the tangent lines of T-invariant curves in Y at xB.

Proposition 6.19. (1) *If $x \geq w$, then*

$$\Phi(TE_{xB}X^w) = \mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_x^w\,. \tag{6.13}$$

If $x \leq w$, then

$$\Phi(TE_{xB}X_w) = \mathrm{Down}_x \cup \mathrm{Up}_{w,x}\,. \tag{6.14}$$

(2) *In type A, $\Phi(T_{xB}X^w) = \Phi(TE_{xB}X^w)$ (for $x \geq w$) and $\Phi(T_{xB}X_w) = \Phi(TE_{xB}X_w)$ (for $x \leq w$).*

Proof. The equalities in (1) follow from the description of T-invariant curves in Schubert varieties given, for example, in [CK03, Section 2], which we now recall. The closed T-invariant curves in X through xB are of the form $\overline{U_\alpha xB}$, where U_α is the root subgroup corresponding to the root α, and $x \leq w$, $s_\alpha x \leq w$. Note that we may assume $\alpha \in x\Phi^-$, since otherwise U_α fixes xB. The tangent space $T_{xB}(\overline{U_\alpha xB})$ has weight α.

By [CK03], the curve $\overline{U_\alpha xB}$ lies in X_w if and only if $x \leq w$ and $s_\alpha x \leq w$. From this one can deduce that $\overline{U_\alpha xB}$ lies in X^w if and only if $x \geq w$ and $s_\alpha x \geq w$. The equalities (6.13) and (6.14) are an immediate consequence. This proves part (1). If G is of type A, then Lakshmibai and Seshadri [LS84] proved that the tangent space $T_{xB}(X_w)$ has the description on the right hand side of (6.14), and from this one can deduce that $T_{xB}(X^w)$ has the description on the right hand side of (6.13). Part (2) follows.

□

Remark 6.20. To deduce the results about invariant curves and tangent spaces for the varieties X^w from the corresponding results for the varieties X_w (as was done in the proof of the previous proposition), we can use the equality $X^w = w_0 X_{w_0 w}$. For example, consider the assertion about T-invariant curves in X^w. We have $\overline{U_\alpha xB} \subset X^w$ iff $w_0\overline{U_\alpha xB} \subset X_{w_0 w}$. But

$$w_0\overline{U_\alpha xB} = \overline{w_0 U_\alpha w_0^{-1} w_0 xB} = \overline{U_{w_0\alpha} w_0 xB}.$$

By [CK03], this is contained in $X_{w_0 w}$ iff $w_0 x \leq w_0 w$ and $s_{w_0\alpha} w_0 x \leq w_0 w$. But $s_{w_0\alpha} w_0 x = w_0 s_\alpha w_0^{-1} w_0 x = w_0 s_\alpha x$. We conclude that $\overline{U_\alpha xB} \subset X^w$ iff $w_0 x \leq w_0 w$ and $w_0 s_\alpha x \leq w_0 w$, or equivalently, $x \geq w$ and $s_\alpha x \geq w$, as desired. The assertion about tangent spaces can be verified similarly.

Corollary 6.21. (1) *Let $w \in W$, and let P be the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic subgroup. Suppose $x \geq w$ (resp. $x \leq w$). We have*

$$\Phi(TE_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w) = \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}^w \tag{6.15}$$

(resp.

$$\Phi(TE_{xB}\mathcal{N}_{w,x}) = \mathrm{Up}_{w,x}^P .) \tag{6.16}$$

(2) *If G is of type A, $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w) = \Phi(TE_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w)$ (for $x \geq w$) and $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_{w,x}) = \Phi(TE_{xB}\mathcal{N}_{w,x})$ (for $x \leq w$).*

Proof. (1) We prove (6.15). Suppose $x \geq w$ and let P be the standard X^w-maximal parabolic subgroup. Suppose $\alpha \in x\Phi^-$. We have $U_\alpha xB \subset X^w \cap C_x$ if and only if $\overline{U_\alpha xB} \subset X^w$, and by Proposition 6.19, this occurs if and only if $\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_x^w$. The curve $U_\alpha xB$ lies in the cell $(U_P^-(x) \cap U)\cdot xB$ if and only if $\alpha \in x\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) \cap \Phi^+ = \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}$. Hence, $U_\alpha xB$ lies in $\mathcal{N}_x^w$ iff α is in the intersection of $\mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_x^w$ and $\mathrm{Down}_{x,P}$, which equals $\mathrm{Down}_{x,P}^w$. This proves (6.15); the proof of (6.16) is similar.

(2) We consider the case of X^w. By Proposition 6.16 and Proposition 6.19,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w) &= \Phi(T_{xB}X^w) \setminus (\mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_{x,L}) \\ &= (\mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_x^w) \setminus (\mathrm{Up}_x \cup \mathrm{Down}_{x,L}) \\ &= \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}^w = \Phi(TE_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w),\end{aligned}$$

proving the assertion for X^w. (Here we have used the fact that because w is minimal in its left W_P-coset, $\mathrm{Down}_{x,L}^w = \mathrm{Down}_{x,L}$, as noted in Remark 6.18.) The proof in the case of X_w is similar. □

Corollary 6.22. *Suppose G is of type A. Let $w \in W$, and suppose that P is the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic subgroup. If $x \geq w$ (resp. $x \leq w$), then x is cominuscule in X^w (resp. X_w) if and only if there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that for all $\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}^w$ (resp. $\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_{w,x}^P$), we have $\alpha(v) = -1$.*

Proof. This follows from Corollary 6.21. □

6.5. **Cominuscule points and inclusions of Schubert varieties.** In this section we use the criteria of Corollary 6.22 to show that in type A, a cominuscule point in a Schubert variety is necessarily cominuscule in certain smaller Schubert varieties (see Proposition 6.24). We begin with a statement relating the cominuscule property to the Bruhat order.

Proposition 6.23. *Let G be of type A. Suppose $w, v, x \in W$.*

(1) *Suppose that $w \leq v \leq x$. Let P (resp. P') be the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X^v-maximal) parabolic subgroup, and suppose $P \subset P'$ (equivalently, suppose v is minimal in its left W_P-coset). If x is cominuscule in X^w, then x is cominuscule in X^v.*

(2) *Suppose that $w \geq v \geq x$. Let P (resp. P') be the standard X_w-maximal (resp. X_v-maximal) parabolic subgroup, and suppose $P \subset P'$ (equivalently, suppose v is maximal in its left W_P-coset). If x is cominuscule in X_w, then x is cominuscule in X_v.*

Proof. (1) Since $P \subset P'$, the reverse inclusion $\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) \supset \Phi(\mathfrak{u}_{P'}^-)$ holds. Hence

$$\mathrm{Down}_{x,P}^w \supset \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}^v \supset \mathrm{Down}_{x,P'}^v .$$

By Corollary 6.22, if x is cominuscule in X^w, then x is cominuscule in X^v.

(2) As in (1), the inclusion $\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) \supset \Phi(\mathfrak{u}_{P'}^-)$ implies

$$\mathrm{Up}_{w,x}^P \supset \mathrm{Up}_{v,x}^P \supset \mathrm{Up}_{v,x}^{P'},$$

and the result follows from Corollary 6.22. □

The more geometric formulation of this proposition is the following result.

Proposition 6.24. *Let G be of type A. Let $w \in W$.*

(1) *Let P be the standard X^w-maximal parabolic subgroup. Let $x \geq w$, and suppose that xP is a cominuscule point of X_P^w. Suppose v is minimal in its left W_P-coset and that $X_P^v \subset X_P^w$. If $xP \in X_P^v$, then xP is a cominuscule point of X_P^v.*

(2) *Let P be the standard X_w-maximal parabolic subgroup. Let $x \leq w$, and suppose that xP is a cominuscule point of $X_{w,P}$. Suppose v is maximal in its left W_P-coset and that $X_{v,P} \subset X_{w,P}$. If $xP \in X_{v,P}$, then xP is a cominuscule point of $X_{v,P}$.*

Proof. We prove (1); the proof of (2) is similar. The conditions that $xP \in X_P^v$ and $X_P^v \subset X_P^w$ are equivalent to $w \leq v \leq x$. If P' is the standard X^v-maximal coset, then since v is minimal in its left W_P-coset, Proposition 4.12 implies that $P \subset P'$. By Proposition 6.23, x is cominuscule in X^v. Hence xP is a cominuscule point of X_P^v. □

We now define some posets associated to a standard parabolic subgroup P.

Definition 6.25. Let P be a standard parabolic subgroup of G. Let Max^P (resp. Max_P) denote the set of $w \in W$ such that P is the standard X^w-maximal (resp. X_w-maximal) parabolic determined by w. For $x \in W$, let $\mathrm{Comin}^P(x)$ (resp. $\mathrm{Comin}_P(x)$) denote the set of w in Max^P (resp. Max_P) such that x is cominuscule in X^w (resp. X_w).

The sets Max^P and Max_P correspond to Schubert varieties in G/B which are inverse images of Schubert varieties in G/P, but are not inverse images of Schubert varieties in any smaller flag variety.

Corollary 6.26. *Let G be of type A.*

(1) *Let $w, v \in \mathrm{Max}^P$ and suppose that $w \leq v \leq x$. If $w \in \mathrm{Comin}^P(x)$, then $v \in \mathrm{Comin}^P(x)$. In other words, $\mathrm{Comin}^P(x)$ is an upper order ideal in $\{w \in \mathrm{Max}^P \mid w \leq x\}$.*

(2) *Let $w, v \in \mathrm{Max}_P$ and suppose that $w \geq v \geq x$. If $w \in \mathrm{Comin}_P(x)$, then $v \in \mathrm{Comin}_P(x)$. In other words, $\mathrm{Comin}_P(x)$ is a lower order ideal in $\{w \in \mathrm{Max}_P \mid w \geq x\}$.*

Proof. This is the special case $P = P'$ of Proposition 6.23. □

Remark 6.27. It is not necessarily true that if $w \leq v \leq x$ and x is cominuscule in X^w then x is cominuscule in X^v. Indeed, if this were true, then since any T-fixed point is cominuscule in X^1 by Proposition 6.7, it would follow that any T-fixed point is cominuscule in any Schubert variety, but Section 7.3 provides an example where this is not the case. The reason this can happen is that the standard X^w-maximal parabolic subgroup may differ from the standard X^v-parabolic subgroup, and these subgroups are part of the definition of cominuscule point. This explains the presence of the parabolic subgroups P and P' in Proposition 6.23.

6.6. **Cominuscule elements of Weyl groups.** Knutson observed that for a λ-cominuscule element x of W, the torus action on the cell $X_x^0 = U \cdot xB$ contains the natural dilation action (see [Knu09, p. 25]), and therefore the ideal of $X^w \cap X_x^0$ in X_x^0 is homogeneous with respect to the standard dilation action. It was noted in [LY12] this condition implies that the Kazhdan-Lusztig ideal can be used to compute Hilbert series and multiplicities. In the context of this paper, Knutson's observation almost immediately implies that x is cominuscule in any X^w with $w \leq x$, and so we can express Hilbert series and multiplicities in terms of pullbacks of Schubert classes. In fact, for such x, the formulas simplify, and greatly resemble the formulas in the case of cominuscule flag varieties given in [IN09, Prop. 12] and [GK15, Theorem 2.10] (see Theorem 6.32). We briefly describe the situation.

Part (1) of Definition 6.28 is not the original definition of minuscule elements, but is equivalent to it by [Ste01, Proposition 5.1].

Definition 6.28. (1) Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}^*$. The element $x \in W$ is λ-minuscule if for all $\alpha^\vee \in I^\vee(w)$, we have $\lambda(\alpha^\vee) = -1$. We say x is minuscule if it is λ-minuscule for some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}^*$.

(2) The element $x \in W$ is cominuscule if it is minuscule for the dual root system. Equivalently, there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that for all $\alpha \in I(x)$, we have $\alpha(v) = -1$.

In this definition we have chosen the normalization $\alpha(v) = -1$ because it is more consistent with this paper, but it would be equivalent to use the condition $\alpha(v) = 1$, since we can replace v by its negative. More useful for us than the definition will be parts (2) and (3) of the following proposition. In fact, (2) could be used as a definition of cominuscule elements; the equivalent formulation in Definition 6.28 was chosen because of its connection with the formulation of [Ste01].

Proposition 6.29. (1) *The element $x \in W$ is cominuscule if and only if x^{-1} is cominuscule.*

(2) *The element $x \in W$ is cominuscule if and only if there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that for all $\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_x$, we have $\alpha(v) = -1$.*

(3) *The element $w_0 x \in W$ is cominuscule if and only if there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that for all $\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x$, we have $\alpha(v) = -1$.*

Proof. Since $I(x) = \Phi^+ \cap x^{-1}\Phi^-$ and $I(x^{-1}) = \Phi^+ \cap x\Phi^-$, we see that $I(x^{-1}) = -xI(x)$. Hence $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ satisfies the condition $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in I(x)$ if and only if $-xv$ satisfies the analogous condition for all $\alpha \in I(x^{-1})$. This proves (1). Part (2) follows from part (1) and the fact that $\mathrm{Down}_x = I(x^{-1})$ by Proposition 6.12. We now prove part (3). Suppose $w_0 x$ is cominuscule. By part (1), so is $(w_0 x)^{-1}$, so there exists $v' \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that $\alpha(v') = -1$ for all $\alpha \in I((w_0 x)^{-1})$. Set $v = w_0 v'$. By Proposition 6.12, $\mathrm{Up}_x = w_0 I((w_0 x)^{-1})$, so $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x$. The converse follows by reversing the argument: if there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that for all $\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x$, we have $\alpha(v) = -1$, then set $v' = w_0 v$. Then $\alpha(v') = -1$ for all $\alpha \in I((w_0 x)^{-1})$, so $w_0 x$ is cominuscule. □

The following proposition shows that cominuscule elements of Weyl groups yield cominuscule points in Schubert varieties. This proposition is a simple consequence of the observation from [Knu09] described above. Note, however, that not all cominuscule points are of this form (see Example 6.5 and Section 7).

Proposition 6.30. *Let $x \in W$.*

(1) *If x is a cominuscule element of W, then x is cominuscule in any Schubert variety X^w containing xB (equivalently, such that $x \geq w$).*

(2) *If $w_0 x$ is a cominuscule element of W, then x is cominuscule in any Schubert variety X_w containing xB (equivalently, such that $x \leq w$).*

Proof. (1) Suppose x is cominuscule, so there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that for all $\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_x$, we have $\alpha(v) = -1$. By Proposition 6.16, for any $w \leq x$, we have $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w) \subset \mathrm{Down}_x$, so by definition, x is cominuscule in X^w. .

(2) Suppose $w_0 x$ is cominuscule. Choose $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x$. By Proposition 6.16, for any $w \geq x$, we have $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_{w,x}) \subset \mathrm{Up}_x$, so by definition, x is cominuscule in X_w. □

Remark 6.31. The converse of Proposition 6.30 is false. For example, in type A_2, the long element w_0 of W is cominuscule in any X^w, but in 1-line notation, $w_0 = (3, 2, 1)$, which is not cominuscule in W by Remark 6.33.

If x (resp. $w_0 x$) is a cominuscule element of W, then the formulas of Theorem 6.14 yield the following simpler formulas, resembling those of [IN09, Prop. 12] and [GK15, Theorem 2.10].

Theorem 6.32. *Let $N = \dim G/B$.*

(1) *Suppose that x is a cominuscule element of W and $x \geq w$. Let v be an element of $\mathfrak{t}$ such that $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_x$. Then*

$$H(X^w, x) = \frac{\mathrm{ev}_v(i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_{X^w}])}{(1-t)^N} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{mult}(X^w, x) = \mathrm{ev}_{-v}(i_x^*[X^w]). \tag{6.17}$$

(2) *Suppose that $w_0 x$ is a cominuscule element of W and $x \leq w$. Let v be an element of $\mathfrak{t}$ such that $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \mathrm{Up}_x$. Then*

$$H(X_w, x) = \frac{\mathrm{ev}_v(i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_{X_w}])}{(1-t)^N} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{mult}(X_w, x) = \mathrm{ev}_{-v}(i_x^*[X_w]). \tag{6.18}$$

Proof. We prove (6.17), under the stated hypotheses. Since $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w) \subset \mathrm{Down}_{x,P} \subset \mathrm{Down}_x$, the element v satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 6.14. Since $\mathrm{ev}_v(1 - e^{-\alpha}) = 1 - t$, in the denominator of the formula for $H(X^w, x)$ from Theorem 6.14, each factor of $\mathrm{ev}_v(1 - e^{-\alpha})$ contributes a factor of $1 - t$. There are $|\,\mathrm{Down}_{x,P}\,| = |x\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) \cap \Phi^+|$

such factors. There are $d' = N - \ell(x) + |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^+|$ other such factors of $1-t$ in the denominator of $H(X^w, x)$, so the total number of such factors is

$$N - \ell(x) + |x\Phi_L^- \cap \Phi^+| + |x\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) \cap \Phi^+| = N.$$

The formula for $H(X^w, x)$ in (6.17) follows. Similarly, the formula for $\mathrm{mult}(X^w, x)$ in (6.17) follows from the corresponding formula in Theorem 6.14, since for $\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}$, $\mathrm{ev}_{-v}(\alpha) = 1$. This proves (6.17); the proof of (6.18) is similar. □

Remark 6.33. In type A_{n-1}, the Weyl group is the symmetric group S_n, and the cominuscule elements are exactly the 321-avoiding permutations (see [Knu09, p. 25]).

7. Examples

In this section we apply the results of earlier sections to Schubert varieties in G/B, where G is of type A_5.

Examples 7.2 and 7.3 deal with the same Schubert variety X^w. Example 7.2 provides an example of a point yB in X^w which is not a cominuscule point; Example 7.3 provides an example of a cominuscule point xB in X^w and uses Theorem 6.14 to compute the multiplicity at this point. Example 7.4 considers the same point xB, but a different Schubert variety X^w. We show that xB is cominuscule in this X^w, and use Theorem 6.14 to compute both the multiplicity and Hilbert series at xB. Finally, in Example 7.5, we illustrate how, starting with a cominuscule x in X^w, it is possible to produce other cominuscule points by modifying x or w. We note that Examples 7.3 and 7.4 are also worked out in [GK17], where combinatorial refinements reduce computations significantly.

The examples above were chosen in part so that the elements x, y and w above are not too special. In particular, x and y are not 321-avoiding (that is, cominuscule elements of W). The element w in Examples 7.2 and 7.3 is neither vexillary (2143 avoiding) nor covexillary (3412 avoiding), although it is cominuscule (321-avoiding). The element w in Example 7.4 is neither 321-avoiding nor vexillary, but it is covexillary. In each of these examples, the maximal X^w-parabolic is not a maximal parabolic, so X^w is not the inverse image of a Schubert variety in a cominuscule flag variety.

Our calculations of multiplicity and Hilbert series depend on Theorem 6.14, and make use of formulas for $i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_{X^w}]$ and $i_x^*[X^w]$ which depend on a choice of reduced expression for x. To calculate multiplicities, one must then consider reduced subexpressions of this reduced expression which multiply to w. Although Examples 7.3 and 7.4 use the same x, we have chosen to use different reduced expressions in these examples to illustrate how the difficulty of the calculation can vary depending on the choice of x. In Example 7.3, there are 15 reduced subexpressions for w, whereas in Example 7.4 there are only 3. This difference is due to the different reduced expression for x, and not to w. If we had used the expression from Example 7.4 in Example 7.3, there would have been only 3 subexpressions for w in that example.

We recall the formulas we will need for $i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_{X^w}]$ and $i_x^*[X^w]$. To state the first formula, we recall the definition of the 0-Hecke algebra associated to a Coxeter system (W, S), over a ring R. This algebra is the free associative R-algebra with basis H_u, $u \in W$, and with multiplication characterized by the following relations: H_1 is the identity element, and if $u \in W$ and $s \in S$, then $H_u H_s = H_{us}$ if $\ell(us) > \ell(u)$ and $H_u H_s = H_u$ if $\ell(us) < \ell(u)$.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $w, x \in W$. For $\mathbf{s} = s_1, \ldots, s_l$ a reduced expression for x,*

$$i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_{X^w}] = (-1)^{l(w)} \sum \left(e^{-r(i_1)} - 1\right) \cdots \left(e^{-r(i_m)} - 1\right) \in K_T(pt) \tag{7.1}$$

$$i_x^*[X^w] = \sum r(i_1) \cdots r(i_d) \in A_T^*(pt), \tag{7.2}$$

where $r(i_j) = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{i_j - 1}(\alpha_{i_j})$. The sum for $i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_{X^w}]$ is over all subexpressions $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_m}$ of $\mathbf{s}$ such that $H_{s_{i_1}} \cdots H_{s_{i_m}} = H_w$ in the 0-Hecke algebra, and the sum for $i_x^*[X^w]$ is over all reduced subexpressions $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_d}$ of $\mathbf{s}$ such that $s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_d} = w$.

The formula for $i_x^*[\mathcal{O}_{X^w}]$ is due to Graham and Willems ([Gra02], [Wil06]) and the formula for $i_x^*[X^w]$ is due Anderson-Jantzen-Soergel and Billey ([AJS94], [Bil99]). Although in this section we work only in type A_5, we point out that this theorem holds for all types.

In type A_{n-1}, $G = \mathrm{SL}_n$, the $n \times n$ matrices of determinant one. Let B be the Borel subgroup of upper triangular matrices in G, and T the maximal torus of diagonal matrices in G. The set of roots of G relative to T is $\Phi = \{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j \mid 1 \le i, j \le n, i \ne j\}$. The set of simple roots determined by B is $\{\alpha_i = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1} \mid 1 \le i \le n-1\}$, and the corresponding set of positive roots is $\Phi^+ = \{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j \mid 1 \le i < j \le n\}$. The Weyl group W is the permutation group S_n, with $w \in W$ acting on $\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j$ by $w(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j) = \epsilon_{w(i)} - \epsilon_{w(j)}$. The transpositions $s_i = (i, i+1)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$, form the set of simple reflections of W.

The Bruhat order in type A_{n-1} may be described combinatorially as follows (see [Hum90, Section 5.9]). If $x = (x(1), \ldots, x(n))$ and $y = (y(1), \ldots, y(n))$ are two permutations in S_n, written in 1-line notation, then $x \le y$ in the Bruhat order if and only if for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, the following holds: if $a_1, a_2, \ldots a_i$ are the numbers $x(1), x(2), \ldots, x(i)$ written in increasing order, and $b_1, b_2, \ldots b_i$ are the numbers $y(1), y(2), \ldots, y(i)$ written in increasing order, then $a_k \le b_k$ for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, i\}$.

By Proposition 6.19 and Corollary 6.21, if $x \ge w$,

$$\Phi(T_{xB} X^w) = \{\alpha \in x\Phi^- \mid s_\alpha x \ge w\}$$

and, if P is the standard X^w-maximal parabolic subgroup, then

$$\Phi(T_{xB} \mathcal{N}_x^w) = \mathrm{Down}_{x,P}^w = \{\alpha \in x\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P^-) \mid x > s_\alpha x \ge w\}.$$

It is convenient, however, to work with $R_x^w := -x^{-1}\Phi(T_{xB}X^w)$ and $S_x^w := -x^{-1}\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w)$, since these are both sets of positive roots. Since $s_\alpha x = xs_{x^{-1}(\alpha)} = xs_{-x^{-1}(\alpha)}$,

$$S_x^w = \{\beta \in \Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P) \mid x > xs_\beta \geq w\} \text{ and } R_x^w = \{\beta \in \Phi^+ \mid xs_\beta \geq w\}.$$

We can use the set S_x^w to test whether x is cominuscule in X^w. The reason is that there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that $\beta(v) = -1$ for all $\beta \in S_x^w$ if and only if there exists $v \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that $\alpha(v) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi(T_{xB}N_x^w)$ if and only if x is cominuscule in X^w. We do not need R_x^w for our cominuscule point calculations, but we determine it in the examples below because it provides a singularity test: xB is singular in X^w if and only if $|R_x^w| > \dim X^w$. If xB is a cominuscule point, whether or not xB is singular can be determined by computing the multiplicity, without knowing R_x^w.

If x is minimal in its left W_P-coset, then we can replace $\Phi(\mathfrak{u}_P)$ by Φ^+ in the above expression for S_x^w, so we have

$$S_x^w = \{\beta \in \Phi^+ \mid x > xs_\beta \geq w\} \text{ and } R_x^w = S_x^w \cup \{\beta \in \Phi^+ \mid xs_\beta > x\}.$$

Since we will be considering expressions of the form xs_α, it is useful to observe that if $x = (a_1, \ldots, a_i, \ldots, a_j, \ldots, a_n)$ in 1-line notation, and $\alpha = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j$, then $xs_\alpha = (a_1, \ldots, a_j, \ldots, a_i, \ldots, a_n)$.

Example 7.2. We work in type A_5. Fix the element w which in 1-line notation is $w = (3, 4, 1, 6, 2, 5)$. We have $\dim X = |\Phi^+| = 15$, and $\dim X^w = \dim X - \ell(w) = 15 - 6 = 9$. Let $P = LU_P$ denote the standard X^w-maximal parabolic subgroup. The simple roots in Φ_L^+ are $\{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_5 - \epsilon_6\}$. In this example, we show that not every T-fixed point in X^w is cominuscule, by showing that for $y = (5, 6, 2, 4, 1, 3)$, yB is not a cominuscule point of X^w. Observe that y is minimal in its left W_P-coset. We compute that

$$\begin{aligned} S_y^w &= \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_6, \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_5, \epsilon_4 - \epsilon_6\} \\ R_y^w &= S_y^w \cup \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_6, \epsilon_5 - \epsilon_6\} \end{aligned}$$

Because S_y^w contains the roots $\beta_1 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_4$, $\beta_2 = \epsilon_4 - \epsilon_6$ and $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_6$, yB is not a cominuscule point of X^w, since if $\beta_1(v) = \beta_2(v) = -1$ then $(\beta_1 + \beta_2)(v) = -2$. However, yB is a nonsingular point of X^w since $\dim T_{yB}X^w = |R_y^w| = 9 = \dim X^w$. Therefore, we can determine $\mathrm{mult}(X^w, yB)$ even though yB is not a cominuscule point of X^w: since X^w is nonsingular at yB, we know that $\mathrm{mult}(X^w, yB) = 1$.

Example 7.3. We take $w = (3, 4, 1, 6, 2, 5)$ as in the previous example. The parabolic $P = LU_P$ and the set Φ_L^+ only depend on w, so they are the same as in that example. We take $x = (5, 6, 3, 4, 1, 2)$. We will show that xB is a cominuscule point of X^w in $X = G/B$, and use this fact to compute the multiplicity of X^w at xB.

Observe that x is minimal in its left W_P-coset. We compute that

$$\begin{aligned} S_x^w &= \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_3, \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3, \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_5, \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_6, \epsilon_4 - \epsilon_5, \epsilon_4 - \epsilon_6\} \\ R_x^w &= S_y^w \cup \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_5 - \epsilon_6\} \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

Since $\dim T_{xB}X^w = |R_x^w| = 11 > 9 = \dim X^w$, X^w is singular at x. Observe that in this example, $S_x^w = -x^{-1}S_x^w = \Phi(T_x\mathcal{N}_x^w)$.

Let $v = \mathrm{diag}(1,1,0,0,-1,-1)$. Then $\alpha(v) = 1$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w)$. (We could replace v by its negative to be consistent with the earlier theory. We use this v instead, and to compensate we substitute ev_v for ev_{-v} in (6.8) to compute multiplicity.) Thus xB is a cominuscule point of X^w.

A reduced expression for w is $s_2s_1s_3s_2s_5s_4$. For simplicity, we write $w = 213254$. We will take the following reduced expression for x (we write a bar in the middle just because it helps keep track of which position an entry occurs, and because the last 6 entries are a reduced expression for w):

$$x = 214354|213254.$$

Using this first reduced expression for x, we find:

$$\begin{aligned}
r(1) &= \alpha_2 = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(2) &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_3 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(3) &= \alpha_4 = \epsilon_4 - \epsilon_5 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(4) &= \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_5 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 2\\
r(5) &= \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = \epsilon_4 - \epsilon_6 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(6) &= \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_6 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 2\\
r(7) &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_5 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 2\\
r(8) &= \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_5 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(9) &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_6 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 2\\
r(10) &= \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_6 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(11) &= \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_4 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(12) &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_4 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\{r(1), \ldots, r(12)\} = I(x^{-1}) = \mathrm{Down}_x$, which equals $\mathrm{Down}_{x,P}$ since x is minimal in its left W_P-coset. Thus $\mathrm{ev}_v\left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathrm{Down}_x}\alpha\right) = 2^4 = 16$, so, by (6.8) and (7.2),

$$\mathrm{mult}(X^w, x) = \frac{1}{16}\sum \mathrm{ev}_v(r(i_1)\cdots r(i_6)), \tag{7.4}$$

where the sum is over all subexpressions $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_6}$ of $s_1, \ldots, s_{12}$ such that $s_{i_1}\cdots s_{i_6} = w$. In order to evaluate this sum, we need to find all such subexpressions.

Below, when given a subexpression described by boxed entries, such as

$$\boxed{21}4\boxed{354}|\boxed{2}13254,$$

we will write "positions 1,2,4,5,6,7" to indicate that those are the positions in our subexpression, and then $\xrightarrow{ev_v} 8$ to indicate that

$$ev_v(r(1)r(2)r(4)r(5)r(6)r(7)) = 8.$$

Recall we are starting with the reduced expressions

$$x = 214354|213254 \text{ and } w = 213254.$$

Note that w is fully commutative (since it is 321-avoiding), so any reduced expression for w must contain the same number of occurrences of each generator as the reduced expression above. Moreover, in such an expression, between the two 2's, there must occur both 1 and 3; both the 3 and the 5 must precede the 4.

We are going to describe the reduced subexpressions of the expression for x which multiply to w. Observe that no such subexpression can contain the first 4 in x, since in a reduced expression for w, the 5 must precede the 4.

There are three 2's in x, and our subexpressions must contain two of them. There are 3 possibilities.

(1) The subexpression contains the first two of the 2's. It must contain the 1 and the 3 between them, so it must contain (the boxed numbers are the ones selected so far):

$$\boxed{21}4\boxed{3}54|\boxed{2}13254.$$

Now we need to get a 54, but we cannot use the first 4. There are 3 possibilities:

$$\boxed{21}4\boxed{354}|\boxed{2}13254 : \text{positions } 1,2,4,5,6,7 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 8$$
$$\boxed{21}4\boxed{35}4|\boxed{2}1325\boxed{4} : \text{positions } 1,2,4,5,7,12 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 4$$
$$\boxed{21}4\boxed{3}54|\boxed{2}132\boxed{54} : \text{positions } 1,2,4,7,11,12 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 4$$

Hence:

Total contribution from these subexpressions: 16.

(2) The subexpression contains the last two of the 2's. We must pick the 1 and the 3 in between the 2's, and since the 4 must occur after the 3, we have so far:

$$214354|\boxed{2132}5\boxed{4}.$$

We can pick either 5, so there are two possibilities:

$$2143\boxed{5}4|\boxed{2132}5\boxed{4} : \text{positions } 5,7,8,9,10,12 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 4$$
$$214354|\boxed{213254} : \text{positions } 7,8,9,10,11,12 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 4$$

Hence:

Total contribution from these subexpressions: 8.

(3) The subexpression contains the first and the last 2. There are two possibilities for the 4 (since the subexpression cannot contain the first 4). We consider them separately.

(3a) If the subexpression contains the second 4, then we have

$$\boxed{2}1435\boxed{4}|213\boxed{2}54.$$

The 5 and the 3 must precede the 4, so we have

$$\boxed{2}14\boxed{354}|213\boxed{2}54.$$

Now we can take either 1, so we have two possibilities:

$$\boxed{21}4\boxed{354}|213\boxed{2}54 : \text{ positions } 1,2,4,5,6,10 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 4$$
$$\boxed{2}14\boxed{354}|2\boxed{1}3\boxed{2}54 : \text{ positions } 1,4,5,6,8,10 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 4$$

Hence:

Total contribution from these subexpressions: 8.

(3b) Suppose the subexpression contains the last 4. Then it contains:

$$\boxed{2}14354|213\boxed{2}5\boxed{4}.$$

The three boxed entries are in positions $1, 10, 12$ and so their contribution in any subexpression under ev_v is to multiply by 1. For the three remaining entries, we can take either 1, either 3, or either 5. So there are 8 possible subexpressions. The 1's are in positions 2 and 8, and in either position, the 1 contributes multiplication by 1 to any subexpression (under ev_v). The 3's are in positions 4 and 9, and in either position, the 3 contributes multiplication by 2. The 5's are in positions 5 and 11, and in either position, the 5 contributes multiplication by 1. We conclude that each of the 8 subexpressions is taken by ev_v to 2. Hence:

Total contribution from these subexpressions: 16

Adding up the total contributions, we conclude from (7.4) that the multiplicity of X^w at x is

$$\frac{1}{16}(16+8+8+16) = 3.$$

Example 7.4. We change w slightly from the previous example, but keep x unchanged. Thus, let $w = (4,3,1,6,2,5)$ and let $x = (5,6,3,4,1,2)$. In this example, as in the previous one, we show that xB is a cominuscule point of X^w in $X = G/B$, and then use (6.8) in order to compute the multiplicity of X^w at xB. We then use (6.7) in order to compute the Hilbert series of X^w at xB. We have $\dim X^w = \dim X - l(w) = 15-7 = 8$.

Let $P = LU_P$ denote the standard X^w-maximal parabolic subgroup. Then $\Phi_L^+ = \{\epsilon_3 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_5 - \epsilon_6\}$. As in the previous example, x is minimal in its left W_P-coset. We compute that

$$S_x^w = \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3, \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_5, \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_6, \epsilon_4 - \epsilon_5, \epsilon_4 - \epsilon_6\}$$
$$R_x^w = S_x^w \cup \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_4, \epsilon_5 - \epsilon_6\}$$

Since $\dim T_{xB}X^w = |R_x^w| = 10 > 8 = \dim X^w$, X^w is singular at x. Observe that S_x^w is a (proper) subset of the set S_x^w computed in the previous example (see (7.3)).

Since $\Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w) = -xS_x^w$, the set of such weights for this example is a subset of those of the previous example. Thus, as in the previous example, we can take $v = \mathrm{diag}(1,1,0,0,-1,-1)$ and have $\alpha(v) = 1$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi(T_{xB}\mathcal{N}_x^w)$, so xB is a cominuscule point of X^w. Again as in the previous example, we substitute ev_v for ev_{-v} in (6.8) to compute multiplicity. Similarly, we substitute ev_{-v} for ev_v in (6.7) to compute the Hilbert series.

Fix the reduced expression 432154324354 for x. This expression corresponds to the *bottom pipe dream* for x (see [BB93]). It was chosen here so that our calculations can be compared more easily with those of [GK17], where calculations are carried out using pipe dreams. For this reduced expression,

$$\begin{aligned}
r(1) &= \alpha_4 = \epsilon_4 - \epsilon_5 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(2) &= \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_5 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(3) &= \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_5 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 2\\
r(4) &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_5 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 2\\
r(5) &= \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = \epsilon_4 - \epsilon_6 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(6) &= \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_6 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(7) &= \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_6 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 2\\
r(8) &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_6 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 2\\
r(9) &= \alpha_2 = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(10) &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_3 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(11) &= \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_4 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1\\
r(12) &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_4 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 1
\end{aligned}$$

We remark that $r(1), \ldots, r(12)$ are the same twelve roots of Down_x computed in the previous example, but because we have used a different reduced expression for x, they are in a different order. Since $\mathrm{ev}_v\left(\prod_{\alpha\in\mathrm{Down}_x}\alpha\right) = 2^4 = 16$, we have

$$\mathrm{mult}(X^w, x) = \frac{1}{16}\sum \mathrm{ev}_v(r(i_1)\cdots r(i_7)), \tag{7.5}$$

where the sum is over all subexpressions $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_7}$ of $s_1, \ldots, s_{12}$ such that $s_{i_1}\cdots s_{i_7} = w$.

Recall we are starting with the reduced expression $x = 432154324354$. It will be helpful to keep in mind the following reduced expression for w:

$$w = 3213254. \tag{7.6}$$

The following subexpressions of x clearly multiply to w:

$$4\boxed{321}54\boxed{32}43\boxed{54}, \qquad 4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{32}435\boxed{4}, \quad \text{and} \quad 4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{324}354. \tag{7.7}$$

We next show that these are the only reduced subexpressions of x which multiply to w.

Any reduced expression for w must contain at least one 1; since there is only one 1 in x, all reduced subexpressions for w in x must contain this 1. Furthermore, since $w(1) = 4$, all reduced subexpressions for w in x must contain the 3 and 2 to the left of the 1, so must contain the following three entries:

$$4\boxed{321}54324354.$$

Since $w(2) = 3$, to the right of the three entries already selected from x, we must take 3 and 2, in that order. There is only one way to do this:

$$4\boxed{321}54\boxed{32}4354.$$

Thus all reduced subexpressions for w in x must contain these five entries. Finally, based on the reduced expression for w in (7.6), we see that any reduced expression for w must contain exactly one 5 and exactly one 4, in that order, and the 4 cannot preceed any 3. The only ways to choose two such entries from x, given the five already selected, are given by (7.7).

The subexpressions (7.7) yield the following contributions to (7.5):

$$\begin{aligned}
4\boxed{321}54\boxed{32}43\boxed{54} &: \text{ positions } 2,3,4,7,8,11,12 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 16\\
4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{32}435\boxed{4} &: \text{ positions } 2,3,4,5,7,8,12 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 16\\
4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{324}354 &: \text{ positions } 2,3,4,5,7,8,9 \xrightarrow{ev_v} 16
\end{aligned}$$

Adding these contributions, we conclude that the multiplicity of X^w at x is

$$\frac{1}{16}(16+16+16) = 3.$$

We next compute the Hilbert series $H(X^w, x)$. Recall that $\mathrm{ev}_{-v}(e^{-\alpha}) = t^{\alpha(v)}$, $N = \dim G/B = 15$, $l(x) = 12$, and $l(w) = 7$. The denominator of the Hilbert series formula (6.7) is

$$\begin{aligned}
(1-t)^{N-l(x)}\,\mathrm{ev}_{-v}\left(\prod_{\alpha\in \mathrm{Down}_x}(1-e^{-\alpha})\right) &= (1-t)^3 \prod_{\alpha\in\mathrm{Down}_x}(1-t^{\alpha(v)})\\
&= (1-t)^3(1-t)^8(1-t^2)^4\\
&= -(t-1)^{15}(t+1)^4,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that of the twelve values of $\alpha(v)$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{Down}_x$, eight equal 1 and four equal 2.

Applying the pullback formula (7.1), we compute the numerator of (6.7):

$$(-1)^{l(w)}\,\mathrm{ev}_{-v}\sum(e^{-r(i_1)}-1)\cdots(e^{-r(i_m)}-1)=-\sum(t^{r(i_1)(v)}-1)\cdots(t^{r(i_m)(v)}-1), \tag{7.8}$$

where the sum is over all subexpressions $s_{i_1},\ldots,s_{i_m}$ of $s_1,\ldots,s_{12}$ such that $H_{s_{i_1}}\cdots H_{s_{i_m}}=H_w$. The following list exhausts all such subexpressions:

$$4\boxed{321}54\boxed{32}43\boxed{54} \qquad 4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{32}435\boxed{4} \qquad 4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{324}354$$
$$4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{32}43\boxed{54} \qquad 4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{324}35\boxed{4}$$

This is proved in [GK17]. These subexpressions yield the following summands of (7.8):

$$\begin{aligned}
&4\boxed{321}54\boxed{32}43\boxed{54} &&: (t-1)^3(t^2-1)^4=(t-1)^7(t+1)^4\\
&4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{32}435\boxed{4} &&: (t-1)^3(t^2-1)^4\\
&4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{324}354 &&: (t-1)^3(t^2-1)^4\\
&4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{32}43\boxed{54} &&: (t-1)^4(t^2-1)^4=(t-1)^8(t+1)^4\\
&4\boxed{3215}4\boxed{324}35\boxed{4} &&: (t-1)^4(t^2-1)^4
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the Hilbert series of X^w at x is

$$H(X^w,x)=\frac{-3(t-1)^7(t+1)^4-2(t-1)^8(t+1)^4}{-(t-1)^{15}(t+1)^4}=\frac{3}{(t-1)^8}+\frac{2}{(t-1)^7}$$

We can recover the multiplicity from the Hilbert series by observing that

$$\frac{3}{(t-1)^8}+\frac{2}{(t-1)^7}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(3\binom{k+7}{7}-2\binom{k+6}{6}\right)t^k.$$

Thus the Hilbert polynomial $h(X^w,x)(k)=3\binom{k+7}{7}-2\binom{k+6}{6}$. The leading term of this polynomial is $\frac{3}{7!}k^7$, so $\mathrm{mult}(X^w,x)=3$.

Example 7.5. From Example 7.3, we know that $x=(5,6,3,4,1,2)$ is cominuscule in X^w for $w=(3,4,1,6,2,5)$. We can produce other cominuscule points by modifying either w or x. Proposition 6.23 implies that x is also cominuscule in X^v, provided that $w\le v\le x$ and the maximal X^v-parabolic P' contains the maximal X^w-parabolic P (or equivalently, if v is minimal in its left W_P coset). For example, if we take $v=(3,5,1,6,2,4)$ then this holds (with $P'=P$); if $v=(3,4,5,6,1,2)$ it holds (with $P'\supsetneq P$).

Corollary 5.12 implies that y is cominuscule in X^w, and moreover that the multiplicity and Hilbert series of X^w at y are the same as those at x, whenever y is in the coset xW_P. Noting that $W_P=\langle s_1,s_3,s_5\rangle$, we could take, for example, $y=(5,6,4,3,1,2)$ or $y=(6,5,4,3,2,1)=w_0$.

References

[AJS94] H. H. Andersen, J. C. Jantzen, and W. Soergel, *Representations of quantum groups at a pth root of unity and of semisimple groups in characteristic p: independence of p*, Astérisque (1994), no. 220, 321. MR 1272539 (95j:20036)

[BB93] Nantel Bergeron and Sara Billey, *RC-graphs and Schubert polynomials*, Experiment. Math. **2** (1993), no. 4, 257–269. MR 1281474 (95g:05107)

[BG03] Brian D. Boe and William Graham, *A lookup conjecture for rational smoothness*, Amer. J. Math. **125** (2003), no. 2, 317–356. MR 1963688

[BGG75] I. N. Bernšteĭn, I. M. Gel′fand, and S. I. Gel′fand, *Differential operators on the base affine space and a study of* $\mathfrak{g}$*-modules*, Lie groups and their representations (Proc. Summer School, Bolyai János Math. Soc., Budapest, 1971), Halsted, New York, 1975, pp. 21–64. MR 0578996

[Bil99] Sara C. Billey, *Kostant polynomials and the cohomology ring for* G/B, Duke Math. J. **96** (1999), no. 1, 205–224. MR 1663931 (2000a:14060)

[BL00] Sara Billey and V. Lakshmibai, *Singular loci of Schubert varieties*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 182, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2000. MR 1782635 (2001j:14065)

[Bri97] M. Brion, *Equivariant Chow groups for torus actions*, Transform. Groups **2** (1997), no. 3, 225–267. MR 1466694

[Bri99] ———, *Rational smoothness and fixed points of torus actions*, Transform. Groups **4** (1999), no. 2-3, 127–156, Dedicated to the memory of Claude Chevalley. MR 1712861

[Bri05] Michel Brion, *Lectures on the geometry of flag varieties*, Topics in cohomological studies of algebraic varieties, Trends Math., Birkhäuser, Basel, 2005, pp. 33–85. MR 2143072

[CK03] James B. Carrell and Jochen Kuttler, *Smooth points of* T*-stable varieties in* G/B *and the Peterson map*, Invent. Math. **151** (2003), no. 2, 353–379. MR 1953262

[EG98] Dan Edidin and William Graham, *Equivariant intersection theory*, Invent. Math. **131** (1998), no. 3, 595–634. MR 1614555

[EG00] ———, *Riemann-Roch for equivariant Chow groups*, Duke Math. J. **102** (2000), no. 3, 567–594. MR 1756110

[EG05] ———, *Nonabelian localization in equivariant* K*-theory and Riemann-Roch for quotients*, Adv. Math. **198** (2005), no. 2, 547–582. MR 2183388

[EH00] David Eisenbud and Joe Harris, *The geometry of schemes*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 197, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000. MR 1730819

[Eis95] David Eisenbud, *Commutative algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 150, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995, With a view toward algebraic geometry. MR 1322960

[FK96] Sergey Fomin and Anatol N. Kirillov, *The Yang-Baxter equation, symmetric functions, and Schubert polynomials*, Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (Florence, 1993), vol. 153, 1996, pp. 123–143. MR 1394950 (98b:05101)

[Ful84] William Fulton, *Intersection theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], vol. 2, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984. MR 732620

[GK08] William Graham and Shrawan Kumar, *On positivity in* T*-equivariant* K*-theory of flag varieties*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2008), Art. ID rnn 093, 43. MR 2439542 (2009g:14061)

[GK15] William Graham and Victor Kreiman, *Excited Young diagrams, equivariant* K*-theory, and Schubert varieties*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), no. 9, 6597–6645. MR 3356949

[GK17] ———, *The combinatorics of cominuscule points in Schubert varieties*, work in progress, 2017.

[Gra01] William Graham, *Positivity in equivariant Schubert calculus*, Duke Math. J. **109** (2001), no. 3, 599–614. MR 1853356 (2002h:14083)

[Gra02] ———, *Equivariant* K*-theory and Schubert varieties*, preprint (2002).

[GW10] Ulrich Görtz and Torsten Wedhorn, *Algebraic geometry I*, Advanced Lectures in Mathematics, Vieweg + Teubner, Wiesbaden, 2010, Schemes with examples and exercises. MR 2675155

[Hum90] James E. Humphreys, *Reflection groups and Coxeter groups*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 29, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. MR 1066460 (92h:20002)

[IN09] Takeshi Ikeda and Hiroshi Naruse, *Excited Young diagrams and equivariant Schubert calculus*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **361** (2009), no. 10, 5193–5221. MR 2515809 (2010i:05351)

[KL79] David Kazhdan and George Lusztig, *Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras*, Invent. Math. **53** (1979), no. 2, 165–184. MR 560412

[KM05] Allen Knutson and Ezra Miller, *Gröbner geometry of Schubert polynomials*, Ann. of Math. (2) **161** (2005), no. 3, 1245–1318. MR 2180402 (2006i:05177)

[Knu09] Allen Knutson, *Frobenius splitting, point-counting, and degeneration*, 2009.

[Kos61] Bertram Kostant, *Lie algebra cohomology and the generalized Borel-Weil theorem*, Ann. of Math. (2) **74** (1961), 329–387. MR 0142696

[Kre05] Victor Kreiman, *Schubert classes in the equivariant K-theory and equivariant cohomology of the Grassmannian*, arXiv:math.AG/0512204, 2005.

[Kre06] ———, *Schubert classes in the equivariant k-theory and equivariant cohomology of the Lagrangian Grassmannian*, arXiv:math.AG/0602245, 2006.

[Lak95] V. Lakshmibai, *Tangent spaces to Schubert varieties*, Math. Res. Lett. **2** (1995), no. 4, 473–477. MR 1355708

[Lak00a] ———, *On tangent spaces to Schubert varieties*, J. Algebra **230** (2000), no. 1, 222–244. MR 1774765

[Lak00b] ———, *On tangent spaces to Schubert varieties. II*, J. Algebra **224** (2000), no. 2, 167–197. MR 1739576

[LS84] V. Lakshmibai and C. S. Seshadri, *Singular locus of a Schubert variety*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **11** (1984), no. 2, 363–366. MR 752799

[LY12] Li Li and Alexander Yong, *Some degenerations of Kazhdan-Lusztig ideals and multiplicities of Schubert varieties*, Adv. Math. **229** (2012), no. 1, 633–667. MR 2854186

[Ric92] R. W. Richardson, *Intersections of double cosets in algebraic groups*, Indag. Math. (N.S.) **3** (1992), no. 1, 69–77. MR 1157520

[Spr09] T. A. Springer, *Linear algebraic groups*, second ed., Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2009. MR 2458469

[Ste01] John R. Stembridge, *Minuscule elements of Weyl groups*, J. Algebra **235** (2001), no. 2, 722–743. MR 1805477

[Tho87] R. W. Thomason, *Algebraic K-theory of group scheme actions*, Algebraic topology and algebraic K-theory (Princeton, N.J., 1983), Ann. of Math. Stud., vol. 113, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1987, pp. 539–563. MR 921490

[Wil06] Matthieu Willems, *K-théorie équivariante des tours de Bott. Application à la structure multiplicative de la K-théorie équivariante des variétés de drapeaux*, Duke Math. J. **132** (2006), no. 2, 271–309. MR 2219259 (2007b:19009)

[WY12] Alexander Woo and Alexander Yong, *A Gröbner basis for Kazhdan-Lusztig ideals*, Amer. J. Math. **134** (2012), no. 4, 1089–1137. MR 2956258

Department of Mathematics, University of Georgia, Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, GA 30602

E-mail address: wag@math.uga.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin - Parkside, Kenosha, WI 53140

E-mail address: kreiman@uwp.edu